THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1927. Vol. XVII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The League of the Subservients.

With the aim of securing the acceptance of the Revised Prayer Book as a preliminary to the restoration of order in public worship a League of Loyalty and Order, which the *Church Times* has charitably dubbed the League of Subservients, has been formed. A number of English Modernists, including the Dean of St. Paul's, have joined the League. It is not to be supposed that their action means that they can heartily approve all that is contained in the Deposited Book. On the contrary, much of it must appear to them to be an unnatural combination of progressive and reactionary tendencies, both in doctrine and worship—a revision as obviously opportunist as it is confessedly temporary. The Bishops have declared, with four notable exceptions, that the acceptance of the Book as a whole is a needful preliminary to the restoration of peace and order in the Church. It is their appeal for support which has moved a number of Modern Churchmen to join the League of Loyalty and Order. How order is to be enforced is not the concern of these Modernist supporters; it is the secret of the episcopate; all that the Modernists are concerned with is that the episcopate has appealed for the support of loyal Churchmen that it may be enabled to enforce order. That is an appeal which Modernists cannot as loyal Churchmen ignore.

They are giving their support to episcopal *legislation*, in order to strengthen episcopal *administration*. They wish to make this quite clear to their fellow-Modernists. They are trusting the episcopate: they cannot believe, as some predict, that the Bishops, having obtained support in the hour of crisis on the plea that they need it to put an end to disorder, will at a later stage betray their supporters by supinely, or timidly, or even treacherously, permitting the disorder to continue.

In view of the situation we venture with all humility to offer the following advice to any of our fellow-Modernists who in view of the episcopal record are of doubtful mind.

First, that they should give all the support that they can to the Bishops to enable the Deposited Book to become law. Secondly, that they should give absolute obedience to the Book when it has become law. Thirdly, that they should give strenuous and active moral support to the bishops in their efforts to enforce obedience to the Book. Fourthly, that by untiring educational work they should prepare the way for a future revision which will remove the shortcomings of the present revision.

When it is charged, and justly, against the present revision that it contains a number of concessions of a reactionary character, it ought to be also recognized that the energetic, courageous, self-denying efforts of Anglo-Catholics for the last three generations have won them. If Modernists are willing to pay the price they can within a generation achieve the modernization of the Church's doctrine and worship, and by so doing make the Church what it has never been since early Elizabethan days—the Church of the English people.

Meanwhile, in the present crisis which threatens disestablishment and disruption, we need to act as constitutionalists and support a policy which promises to secure order and peace. There is an admirable sentence in one of Oliver Cromwell's speeches, recently cited in another connection, which expresses the feelings of a vast number of sober English Churchmen who are sick and weary of the liturgical fights and irregularities of the last fifty years:

> 'I am hugely taken with the word *settlement*: with the thing and with the notion of it. And, indeed, I think he is not worthy to live in England who is not.'

The Rights of the Parochial Laity.

The recent Charge[1] delivered by Dr. Headlam draws particular attention to a general rubric inserted in the Deposited Book. It runs as follows:

> 'Inasmuch as it is to be desired that changes sanctioned by this book in the customary arrangement and conduct of the Services should not be made arbitrarily or without the good will of the people as represented in the Parochial Church Council: any question which may arise between the Minister of a parish and the people as so represented with regard to such changes shall stand referred to the Bishop of the Diocese, who after such consultation as he shall think best both with the Minister and with the people shall make orders thereupon, and these orders shall be final.'

The Bishop's comment runs as follows:

> 'Here the authority of the people as represented in their Parochial Church Council with regard to innovations is definitely and clearly laid down. No change is to be made in the services by introducing anything allowed in this book without the consent of the people. . . . If he (the Bishop) found that a small majority of the Parochial Church Council was acting contrary to the wishes of a large majority of the electoral roll, he might overrule the Church Council. But he is bound to ensure that the minister of the parish acts as far as possible in harmony with the people of the parish. If the people want a change and the minister does not, they may appeal to the Bishop, but he cannot order the minister to make a change which he does not wish. The proposed Measure is constructed to respect the scruples of any clergyman who might feel that something is required of him in the new book which was not contained in his ordination vow.'

This protection of existing rights is very important and should re-assure those who fear that the authorization of the Deposited Book will necessarily lead to changes in their parochial services. It need not do so, if the parishioners do not desire change, and will exhibit sufficient energy and interest to place their names on the electoral roll and attend parochial meetings. There is one important point to which the rubric does not refer, and that is the time of the Sunday services. The morning congregations in many parish churches have been reduced to a few women and a number of children as the result of substituting a sung Eucharist for the Morning Prayer, Litany or Ante-Communion, and Sermon, to which the parishioners have been long accustomed. Great numbers of English Churchmen believe that the Communion Service is one at which it is a duty to communicate; they dislike non-communicating attendance, and do not find themselves edified by 'assisting at Mass.' They

[1] *The New Prayer Book*, published by John Murray, price 2/6 net (1927).

have a right to be suited in this matter: the early morning weekly Celebration, with an additional mid-day monthly Celebration following Morning Prayer, they have found helpful, and it is a great hardship that so many parochial clergy should be arbitrarily depriving their parishioners of what they desire. In certain churches, in order to discourage Sunday morning attendance at Morning Prayer, that service is put at an inconvenient hour, and is deliberately said in a slovenly and irreverent manner while preparations are being made in the church for a sung Eucharist or High Mass. The spirit of the rubric cited permits an appeal to the Bishop in such cases, and we hope that the Bishops will not be slow to terminate such exhibitions of clerical tyranny.

The Regulation of Reservation.

The Episcopal rules for the regulation of reservation seem adequate if the clergy can be won to accept them. The question is a clerical one. The bulk of the English laity do not desire the reserved sacrament. What the English layman values is the Holy Communion Service, not the sacramental elements. For him the service is primary; the elements subsidiary and secondary. With a section of the clergy this is not the case, and it is to clericalist teaching that we owe the stress on the elements apart from the service. The demand for reservation, though ostensibly urged on behalf of the sick layman, is really being urged in the interests of this section of the clergy, who are protagonists for the rule of fasting communion and object if they can help it to celebrate more than once a day, in this respect a great contrast to the older clergy who were willing to celebrate four or five times a day if there were parishioners who desired the service. Let it be clearly understood that it is to suit this new type of English clergyman that we are having reservation authorized. This being the case, it is particularly their duty to accept the regulations for reservation loyally and to shun all evasion. If evasion is attempted when once the regulations are legalized, it must end either in secession to Rome or the creation of an Anglican schism. But these evils are better far than the present state of disorder and strife.

The Common Communion Cup.

There seems to be a growing desire that intinction, or separate cups, should be used at Holy Communion in the English Church, and that the Deposited Book should provide for this. The following letter was sent to us for publication by the Ven. Beresford Potter, Archdeacon in Cyprus. It is not the only one received on this subject:

> 'Having within the last few days consulted three distinguished medical men on this subject, two verbally and one by letter, in all cases the verdict was against the present Anglican method, and two favoured either the Roman or the Eastern Orthodox. The following words were included in a letter from a distinguished Scottish medical man: "My candid opinion regarding the practice of giving the same communion cup of wine to hundreds of people is that it is unhygienic and altogether disgusting. I have no scientific grounds for saying that there is any real danger to health. That could only be proved by having a bacteriological examination made of the cup and its contents. My own feeling is that there is distinct danger of carrying infection from one person to another. It must in the case of many people detract from their devotions to know that they have to put their lips to the cup after a person of doubtful cleanliness. The most hygienic method is that now practised in all our Presbyterian Churches.'

More than five-and-twenty years ago the writer of these paragraphs sat as a member of the Wellington Synod in New Zealand when this matter was brought up. The Bishop decided that two well-known medical men who were members of the Synod should be asked to give their opinion. The substance of their reply was that the risk of infection appeared to be exceedingly slight, seeing that the clergy, who as a class were both long-lived and healthy, not only drank first, but also last, from the chalice, and even consumed the ablutions without ill effects. They argued that to travel in public vehicles, to attend badly ventilated theatres and churches, to sit in rooms with closed windows and breathe the air which had already been breathed by other people, was a much more unhygienic proceeding. They added that fear and a low state of health rendered people liable to infection, and that in all probability some means of infection was always at hand to take advantage of these conditions. They did not add, what we venture to add, that a steadily rising standard of personal cleanliness, and not least among religious people, renders the risk of infection even smaller than formerly. Perhaps the best means of testing public

feeling and of meeting what seems to be a growing sensitiveness would be to have an additional monthly or even weekly Communion Service in populous parishes at which intinction would be used.

An Impression of the recent Parisian Congress.

We publish with pleasure the following impression of the recent Congress at Paris, contributed by Dr. Coulton, the mediaeval historian.

'This year's meeting of the *Congrés d'Histoire du Christianisme*, at the Collège de France, was arranged as a special tribute to Professor Alfred Loisy, who is now seventy years old. Its transactions will be published in due course; meanwhile a brief report might interest readers of *The Modern Churchman*.

'Some 250 to 300 persons, including delegates from thirty-six universities and learned societies, attended the Congress. My work compelled me to come home on the fourth day; but conscientious attendance through the first three days brought me to the same conclusion which has since been printed in a Parisian weekly by Professor P. Alfaric, the Strasbourg delegate. He emphasized the wide divergences of standpoint between the different readers of papers and speakers at the discussions, and yet the complete harmony which marked the proceedings; each was out for the truth, and that proved a sufficient bond of union. It was worth going to Paris to see and hear Loisy himself; an extraordinary combination of the devoted man of science and the simple parish priest; driven out of the Christian fold by the impetus of his reaction against convention, remorseless in his analysis of Christian origins, yet with that urbanity and simplicity of manner which characterizes the best class of village curé. A distinguished professor told us, in M. Loisy's absence, the story of his inaugural lecture when he had been appointed to the Chair of Comparative Religion at the Collège de France. A certain group of students was resolved to break up this lecture, in protest against the appointment of an ex-priest and an excommunicate to this distinguished post. Our informant was told of this by other students who valued religious freedom; so he determined to appeal to the students themselves. He went into the medical schools, and pointed out that, however little they might care for the matters

in dispute, here was a question of free speech, in which every scientific student is concerned. He was thus easily able to enlist two medical students for each potential interrupter. In fact, after a few minutes, one zealot seized at a sentence which offended his susceptibilities and began to shout. In a fraction of a second a hand was placed over his mouth, and two stalwart medicos carried him out and deposited him in the courtyard. The rest of the lecture was heard in respectful silence.

'Of those I heard at the Congress (where, of course, we had to divide into sections, since there were nearly fifty papers) three seemed of special interest, apart from the President's address and Professor Loisy's two speeches. Professor Zielinski of Warsaw traced the development of ethical principles from Homeric morality to Socratic, and from Socratic to Christian. Professor Alphandéry (Paris) traced very definite survivals of Gnostic doctrines in the obscurer heresies of the Middle Ages; and Professor Krüger of Giessen explained the history of the famous motto : *In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas.*[1] It is a great compliment to Protestantism that the sentence should be generally attributed to St. Augustine, or, alternatively, to St. Vincent of Lérins. The germ of it is in Isaac Casaubon's letter to Cardinal Duperron (1612). Shortly afterwards, in 1626, a German Lutheran, Peter Meiderlin, published a book called *Paraenesis Motiva pro Pace Ecclesiae*, in which the sentence occurs word for word; and it was borrowed soon afterwards by another Lutheran, Ruprecht Menden, in a book published at Frankfurt on the Oder. But I think a good many readers of *The Modern Churchman* will wish to see the whole collection of papers, which will be published at a moderate price. The Congress Secretary was Mlle. M. Brunot, 41 Rue Gay-Lussac, Paris; and all visitors must have been impressed by the pleasant and business-like management of the Congress.'

The Wisdom of Crockford.

Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1927[1] has multiplied its cross-references and increased, if possible, its accuracy. Its Preface, which constitutes an admirable annual register of eccle-

[1] Unity in essentials, liberty in non-essentials, in both charity.

[1] Published by the Oxford University Press, price 36/- and £2/2/0 (1927).

siastical events, is as usual eminently judicious in its selection and its criticism.

The alarming information which it imparts in reference to ordinands suggests that the series of carefully engineered stunts of the last ten years, beginning with the National Mission, has proved futile. The Church of England appears to be a declining force in the national life. It is best to give Crockford's own words :

> 'Since our last issue there has been no appreciable improvement in the number of men offering themselves for the Ministry of the Church. The figure for the two provinces of Canterbury and York for the year ending September, 1926, was 354, as against 350 during the previous twelve months. . . . There is no apparent prospect of any considerable increase in the immediate future. It looks as if the Church of England cannot count on more than about 350 new recruits a year for some time to come. Of these a very large number are quite unable to provide themselves with an adequate education. The average age of the existing clergy was said, a short time ago, to be nearer sixty than fifty, and this means that the rate of death and retirement, which appears at present to be about 550 *per annum*, will accelerate rapidly during the next ten years. The situation is in reality even worse than the bare figures suggest. Additions to the Prayer Book may enrich public worship in various ways, and the Church Assembly may pursue its ideals of efficiency with unabated satisfaction to itself. But all the while the backbone of the Church is being slowly broken by the fact that men to do the work are not forthcoming. It is equally difficult either to assign a cause or to suggest a remedy. But we doubt whether the importance and urgency of the question have yet been realized by the laity—even by the House of Laity. It is not too much to say that if the history of the last ten years is continued for another ten, the effective maintenance of the parochial system will have become impossible in all but a few favoured localities. Anything which can fairly be called *The Church of England* will have ceased to exist, and its place will have been taken by the sporadic activities of a denomination.'

This falling-off in the supply of ordinands, as Bishop Henson points out, is not an Anglican phenomenon only. He holds it to be due to the diminution, sterility and poverty of the classes from which the clergy were largely recruited, and to the loss of independence and status by the beneficed clergy as the result of the Enabling Act. To this he adds the secularization of educational posts. There is truth in this explanation, but we regard it as very inadequate. The number of our public-school boys has greatly increased since the war, as has also the number of graduates in the English Universities. No doubt the sons of professional men, especially the sons of the clergy, are fewer in

numbers; possibly the sons of the *nouveaux riches* are more attracted to a commercial career than to a profession which offers little in the way of emolument; nevertheless there seems to be no more certain indication that the Church of England is losing the confidence and affection of the educated classes of this country than the fact that so very few young men in those classes are willing to serve in her ministry. This unwillingness may be due to the prevalence of materialist and hedonist ideals; it may also be due to intellectual difficulties in the way of accepting the traditional dogmas of Christianity; it may perhaps be attributed to the waning social influence of the clergy and their increasing failure to win the confidence of young educated men and women. It is probably due in some measure to all these causes. Our own experience has been that intellectual difficulties do repel many. Also the conventional conception of the clergyman's life as one engaged in officiating at an endless round of daily services, conducting innumerable mothers' meetings, running boys' clubs and paying sick visits does not, as a life's vocation, appeal to the rational and moral consciousness of modern educated men.

If the Christian ministry seemed an affair of moral and spiritual leadership, if it presented itself as a great educational and social and philanthropic enterprise, if it gave more scope for initiative, originality and adventure than it seems to do, it would, we believe, appeal to a number of educated young men of the best type. The tendency to make the clergyman's life a rigid routine, which strictly limits his methods and utterances, and even his thoughts, may attract the server type of young Churchman, but it will attract few others to-day.

The situation in which we find ourselves has taken years to develop; it is the product of that cautious Church leadership which has consistently aimed at safety and has listened deferentially to middle-aged conservatism and the voice of tradition, but has not responded to the crudely expressed convictions of youthful revolt. In its endeavours to satisfy the majority, it has ignored its prophets and has fallen behind both intellectually and morally. A living Church cannot be governed successfully by bureaucratic conservatism. The attempt is bound to culminate in the sacrifice of truth, and to dull the ear to the monitions

of the Spirit. It is clear that a situation which it has taken years to create, it will take years to remedy, and the remedy will require courage and insight of no ordinary kind.

An American newspaper has been discussing recently whether it is possible to love Abraham Lincoln and to despise the United States? It has patriotically decided that it is impossible. Our Church authorities also seem tempted to assume that those who despise the Church cannot love Jesus Christ. Perhaps if our authorities could make love of Jesus Christ the only test for admission to the Church's ministry, provided that that love were willing to undergo rigorous training; and if after ordination the Church authorities could grant large freedom to the clergy in teaching and working, provided only that the Christian life were lived, we might see not only many attracted to the Church's ministry who are now repelled, but amazing harvests crown their labours.

These suggestions may seem, to use Sir Thomas Browne's phrase, 'sick men's dreams, dreams out of the ivory gate, and visions before mid-night'; nevertheless a Church policy which aims at granting to those who minister in Christ's name the fullest exercise of the spirit of love, truth and freedom, provided they be first trained to exercise it aright, is the only real remedy if it be combined with a truer presentation of Christ's Religion. If realised, it would at least deliver the clerical life from the charge of dull routine and conventional futility.

The Anti-Evolution Movement in U.S.A.

From a bulletin issued recently by the Science Service of the United States, it would appear that the great campaign initiated to banish the teaching of evolution from American schools has failed. During the 1926-1927 season no less than twelve state legislatures had anti-evolution bills brought before them, and all twelve have adjourned without the passage of a single one of them.

In six of the states, California, Delaware, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina and North Dakota, the bills did not even get to the floor of their respective Houses, but were disposed of in committee, by decisive or even unanimous votes. In Missouri, which was declared in advance by the Funda-

mentalist forces to be a pivotal state, the bill reached the House and was there rejected by the very solid margin of 82 to 62. In West Virginia and Oklahoma anti-evolution bills were defeated by House votes of 57—36 and 46—30 respectively.

The fight was begun very early in Arkansas and carried on aggressively by the champions of the bill, and it was expected that this state would pass over into the Tennessee-Mississippi class so far as freedom of teaching was concerned. But it turned out otherwise, for after passing the lower house by a very close margin (three votes, according to one report; one vote, according to another) it was rejected in the Senate by an overwhelming aye-and-nay vote. A part of the clergy in Arkansas are reported to be very angry over the outcome of the contest, and to have declared war on all members of the legislature who are known to have voted against the bill. They are also circulating a petition to have the measure placed before the voters at the 1928 election for direct decision by a referendum vote, a procedure followed on occasion in some of the American states.

In only two states has the proposed repressive legislation survived even in an attenuated form. In Alabama a bill on the Tennessee model was introduced during January and remained sleeping in committee until, in March, the legislature adjourned until June 7. What will happen then no one will undertake to prophesy. In South Carolina the bill likewise slept until the closing hours of the session, when it was reported on by the committee, without recommendation; in order, its author stated, that it might remain on the calendar until the next session.

The Florida legislature meets much later in the year than do the law-making bodies of the other states; it convened early in April. An anti-evolution bill was promptly introduced and at the present moment is being hotly debated; its ultimate fate remains upon the knees of such gods as have a taste for statutory regulation of American beliefs and morals. It is predicted at present that it will not pass, and that if by any chance it does it will be vetoed by the Governor.

Even the two states that have enacted anti-evolution laws can hardly be counted as completely gained by the Fundamentalist forces. In delivering its decision on the appeal of the Scopes case, the Tennessee State Supreme Court Justices gave

three interpretations of the law, which are taken to mean that evolution may be taught provided that it is not made to suggest atheism or materialism.

Action by the Education Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in condemning anti-evolution legislation was hailed as highly significant by American educationalists. The resolution was introduced by the President of Duke University, one of the largest and most influential of Southern educational institutions, and only two unidentified delegates voted against it. Prominent Southern Baptists have definitely opposed legislative restrictions on teaching. All the other churches have fought this wave of obscurantism virtually from the start, but the Southern Methodists and Southern Baptists are by far the most numerous in the American South, and this evidence of a change of heart on the part of their clergy is taken as an encouraging sign.

Checked in their programme of stopping the teaching of modern science by legislative action, the Fundamentalists have adopted a new programme, which may become the more formidable because it is so widely diffused and because it deliberately appeals to the willingness of certain types of persons to play the spy and informer. The 'Supreme Kingdom,' founded by Edward Young Clarke, formerly prominent in Ku Klux Klan circles, announces as part of its plan to operate through small local organizations to prevent the employment of teachers who believe in evolution and to turn out of office such school officials as back them. That this course is possible was hinted even in the Tennessee State Supreme Court's decisions on the Scopes case. The growth of the Supreme Kingdom appears to have suffered a severe check at Macon. Dr. Straton, the Fundamentalist champion, was coldly received by most of the civic organizations of Macon, and shortly after cancelled his speaking engagements and returned to New York. Since then whatever activities the Supreme Kingdom may have carried on have attracted little attention, at least in the open There is no denying, however, that subterranean operations of this kind, whether nationally organized or not, have the possibility of becoming formidable, and may succeed where the open attempt to carry repression by legislation has failed.

Heresy-hunting in Ireland.

The North of Ireland is vexed by heresy-hunting. One of the victims is Professor Davey of the Presbyterian College at Belfast; the other the Rev. R. C. Seaver, B.D., Rector of Malone. It is the latter case with which we are primarily concerned, as Mr. Seaver, who was ordained priest by Temple when he was Bishop of London, is a member of the Churchmen's Union. The charges have been filed in the Court of the General Synod by two clergymen and four laymen, and a Commission, as the law directs, has been appointed to investigate them. The charges number twelve, and it is worth while to enumerate them and the utterances upon which they are based.

(1) Denial of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity by teaching that:

> 'The names Father, Son, Spirit, are a mode of expressing the several operations towards humanity of the Parent Spirit in whom we live and move and have our being. The names do not represent three different persons as is commonly supposed, since that is Tritheism against which the Unitarian raised and still raises his needful protest. . . . The names Father, Son, Spirit, are of course accommodations to the mind of finite man of the several operations as regards humanity of the Universal Spirit. In their deepest meaning they represent Love in its essential being, manifestation, eternal utterance and appeal to man to rest in the infinity and endlessness of the God who made him.' 'The Universal Soul expressed by the word Trinity and specifically incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth.' 'Patripassianism was in itself the assertion of a profound truth.'

We have no doubt that Mr. Seaver has used the term 'persons' in the modern sense of personalities or individuals, not in the technical sense which the word Person has in dogmatic theology. In that case his statement that the names do not represent three individuals is entirely orthodox and is equally in agreement with St. Thomas Aquinas and Dean Hastings Rashdall.

(2) Denial of the Atonement by teaching that:

> 'For a Jew the language of Religion was the language of sacrifice, and such was naturally made use of by St. Paul and other writers, though it is not found in the narrative of the Gospel itself, where there is no trace of the doctrine that God accepted the suffering and death of His Son as an equivalent for those due to the sins of men . . . The Lord Himself taught His disciples to regard His death as the seal or pledge of the New Covenant assuring a new relation between God and man, and not as a sacrifice offered for the remission of sins. . . . The death of Christ therefore was not needed to change God, but to change human nature . . . Christ's atonement was a natural result

> of His perfect humanity, not an arbitrary mode of meeting and satisfying Divine claims. . . . Christ's death was an illustration and not a cause of the Divine love, as His sufferings were in no sense propitiatory but demonstrative of the reality of His humanity.' 'Never did Jesus proclaim that man's salvation depended upon His death, who gave His life rather than be untrue to the inner light, not as a ransom but as a revelation to the world. To believe that the sin of our race gathered in one huge penalty upon the head of Christ as He hung upon the Cross gives a truly dreadful conception of the character of God—a wrathful demon who hates His children and will only be appeased by the suffering of the innocent. This "Plan of Salvation" so frequently set forth is merely the work of the theologians, a web of celestial tactics to outwit the Devil, and certainly is not real Christianity. The assertion that the salvation of man depended upon the shedding of Christ's Blood is simply untrue.' 'Why did Christ die? We may rule out all the old-world conceptions implied in the use of the legal words satisfaction, substitution, atonement.' 'The real nature then of the sacrifice of Christ contradicts any idea of propitiation.'

Here in direct and popular language Mr. Seaver presents his readers with that view of the Atonement which ever since the days of Peter Abelard has had a growing body of Christian opinion behind it. We can find it in the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Rashdall and in the Hulseans of Canon J. M. Wilson, and in many less well-known modern Anglican theologians. In the English Church, F. D. Maurice and Bishop B. F. Westcott were mainly responsible for its revival among us.

(3) Denial of the Resurrection by teaching that:

> 'The actual Resurrection was not from Joseph's tomb but from the body left hanging on the Cross. . . . The New Testament speaks nowhere of the Resurrection of the body or of the flesh.' 'How inadequate then is the old theological account of the Resurrection as a miracle which proved Christ's divinity and accredited the apostleship of those who saw it? . . . Let us call the Resurrection a telepathy of the spirit. . . . During the forty days the personal being of Jesus was Discarnate.'

It was the notable Bishop Horsley who more than a century ago declared that the stone was rolled away from the door of the sepulchre not to let the Lord out, but to let the women in. It was John Locke, the philosopher, who more than two centuries ago informed Bishop Stillingfleet that the phrases 'resurrection of the flesh' and 'resurrection of the body' were not to be found in the New Testament. Mr. Seaver's use of the modern terms 'telepathy' and 'discarnate' represent an endeavour to make the resurrection of Jesus Christ credible to

modern minds, and although there are both Traditionalists and Modernists who have no liking for this phraseology, the use of it cannot be reasonably construed as heresy.

(4) Denial that the God of the Old Testament is the same as the God of the New Testament.

This is to make Mr. Seaver a modern Marcionite. Marcion fell into heresy because he could not conceive, any more than his orthodox contemporaries, of a progressive revelation of God in the Old and New Testaments. When this progressive revelation is recognised, as it is by Mr. Seaver, the conflict between the cruder conceptions of God in the minds of Old Testament writers and the more perfect conceptions of New Testament writers is eliminated. The new ideas replace the old, but the old are immensely interesting and important in assisting us to trace the evolution of the new and, by comparison, to appreciate them at their full worth.

(5) Denial of the Plenary Verbal Inspiration of Scriptures by teaching that :

> 'A belief in the verbal and plenary inspiration of the Bible, which has been the occasion of so much theological error and religious confusion, is now generally admitted to be unhistorical, improbable, impossible.'
>
> 'The Bible is the record, differing greatly in value in different parts, of how in olden days certain great men inspired by God gave out their thoughts of Him to the world. Such thoughts were not always true and never equal to the reality. It is a human record and therefore has human weakness and fallibility. We use the Bible rightly when we use it as containing truths of eternal value to us as spiritual beings, inspired because inspiring.'
>
> 'Many things in the New Testament Christ would not have approved, that St. Paul's theology was not Christ's theology. . . .'

The first two quotations would be accepted as true by most orthodox English theologians to-day. The third might seem to some 'a hard saying,' nevertheless the Pauline Theology does differ from the Theology of our Lord, and there are things even in the New Testament which we cannot conceive of Christ having taught and which we cannot feel have His approval even though some of them are attributed to Him.

(6) The teaching of Pantheism by stating that :

> 'Man is not something separate from the Universe but a part of it, and the Universe is a part of God.'

This statement is too slight and vague to base a charge of Pantheism upon it. It might be reasonably interpreted as not going beyond such phrases of St. Paul as 'Of Him, and through Him, and unto Him are all things' (*Rom.* xi, 36); 'In order that God may be all things in all' (I *Cor.* xv, 28; cf. *Eph.* iv, 6-10).

(7) The teaching of Pelagianism by writing that:

'Death then, the normal conclusion of that brief parenthesis in endless progress called human life, is the gift of the same wise and tender Father who gave life, and is as loving a part of His arrangement of the affairs of His family as sleep, night, or winter or any other of the appointments of His Fatherhood.'

We had almost forgotten that orthodoxy in the persons of St. Paul and St. Augustine teaches that physical death is due to the sin of our first parents; nevertheless we know that when it does so teach it is teaching what physical science proves to be undoubtedly false, for physical death was in the world some millions of years before man appeared.

(8) Misrepresenting the Advent by writing that:

'The words "Son of Man" represent the flower and perfection of humanity, and so this Son of Man in general is just man showing himself, his intrinsic divinity, his real oneness with God. Is there a more intelligible description of human progress than "The Coming of the Son of Man"? . . . Only in the coming of the perfect man, only in the Son of Man, the true outcome of all the generations of mankind, leaving whatever is bad and base and corrupt and therefore inhuman behind, . . . is the perfection of our world to come. . . . Thus in government, in learning, in society the coming of the Son of Man is the standing forth, suddenly or slowly, of the perfect man from the midst of all the mistakes, corruptions, delays of human history.'

'Their Master's return . . . lay rather in the uplifting and purifying of the standards of life by the ever-present spirit of Jesus.'

It may be frankly admitted that Mr. Seaver's conception of the Advent is not that of traditional Christianity, which is essentially apocalyptic and cataclysmic, whereas his conception of it is that it is a moral and spiritual process working itself out in human history. The traditionalist conception of the Advent is discredited to-day except in a diminishing number of stagnant ecclesiastical backwaters. It was a possible belief for the first generations of Christians nurtured in Jewish Apocalypticism, but the Fourth Gospel gave to more philosophically-minded Christians a truer conception of the fulfilment of Christ's promise, and it is this which Mr. Seaver is teaching.

(9) Disbelief in Biblical miracles by teaching that:

'To a generation trained to read history in a modern temper, it is most natural that our historical sense should feel startled when in the Gospels we are invited to receive miraculous statements as verified facts. The New Testament student is perfectly justified, indeed he owes it to himself as a seeker after truth, in most carefully investigating the grounds upon which the demand is made. And further compelled as he must be by the weight of evidence to acknowledge the supernatural elements in the Gospels, he is certainly not thereby precluded from critically examining the various miracles recorded and accepting some as genuine while others he assigns to a different order.'

This very temperate statement represents the view of most modern Biblical scholars and received the support of that great Irish scholar and teacher, Dr. George Salmon, in his posthumously published book *The Human Element in the Gospels.*

(10) Doubt as to the visible ascension of the Lord's Body by stating that:

'Recent Criticism has denied the necessity for a visible Ascension of our Lord, and what we have already said as to the constitutional necessity—apart from evidential reasons—of a material manifestation of the Risen Christ cognisable by the senses, is also applicable here. A physical going upwards such as is described by the Evangelists is certainly not the only conceivable manner of His departure from the precincts of the visible.'

The late Canon Glazebrook wrote:

'Some clauses in the Apostles' Creed, which were unquestionably believed by the early Church to be literal statements of fact, are now regarded by Churchmen of all schools as purely symbolical, because knowledge has made their literal truth inconceivable to educated men. In other words, it is generally recognised that in each of these cases a spiritual truth was presented under the form of a material image adapted to the comprehension of the age which produced it; and that whereas the truth signified remains, the material image, grown obsolete, rather obscures than exhibits it. The clauses in question are as follows: "He descended into hell. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God. The resurrection of the flesh."'[1]

Some controversy with Dr. Chase, Bishop of Ely, followed the publication of the volume in which these words occur, but Dr. Glazebrook's right to interpret the Creed in this way was recognized by his Bishop, and no prosecution for heresy followed.

(11) Doubt as to the miraculous mode of our Lord's Birth. Some twenty-four years ago Dean Armitage Robinson, in a notable letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote these words:

[1] *The Faith of a Modern Churchman*, pp. 77-78.

'To say that the historical fact of the Virgin-birth is a cardinal doctrine of the faith is to use language which no Synod of Bishops, so far as I am aware, has ever ventured to use. It is to confuse the Incarnation with the special mode of the Incarnation in a way for which Christian theology offers no precedent.'[2]

(12) Denial of Everlasting Punishment.

Ever since F. D. Maurice was deprived of his Professorship at King's College, London, for attacking the doctrine of everlasting punishment it has steadily lost ground in orthodox Anglican pulpits. It is rare indeed for anyone to attack it now, for hardly anyone believes it. All sin is punished, but punishment follows by way of natural consequence. 'Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap'—but the terrible doctrine of everlasting torment has been surrendered because it conflicts with belief in the Fatherhood of God.

Mr. Seaver's three books upon which the heresy charges are based are *To Christ through Criticism. What of our Dead in the Great War? The Meaning of Things.* Although his books are popular in style, their author is a scholar, and was Donnellan Lecturer at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1905-6.

It must not be supposed that there is any episcopal support for the proceedings against Mr. Seaver, and, as we understand that his parishioners are behind him, we may reasonably hope that the heresy-hunters will stand no more chance of success than they would in the Church of England. These charges indicate, however, if such an indication were needed, how much Christian teaching has advanced in the last fifty years and what a number of false and dubious doctrines, which had the weight of traditional authority behind them, have been cast as rubbish to the void.

Roman Catholic Converts in England.

Our statement in the March *Modern Churchman* (p. 669) that 'the Church of England is rapidly becoming the main instrument in this country for training converts—about 12,000 *per annum*—for the Church of Rome,' has been challenged in some quarters, including Japan.

Our estimate of the number of converts was derived from three sources:

[2] *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation*, p. xiv.

(1) The Protestant Press Bureau, which, under the heading 'Conversions to Roman Catholicism in England and Wales,' published in January, 1927, the following figures: 1920, 12,621; 1921, 11,621; 1922, 12,406; 1923, 12,796; 1924, 12,355; 1925, 11,948.

(2) A statement by Fr. Ronald Knox, read by us in a French Protestant newspaper, that the converts to Rome in this country are some 13,000 *per annum*.

(3) Another set of figures derived from a Romanist source based on diocesan returns. This worked out at about the same rate.

The statement that the bulk of the converts are from the English Church is derived from our own experience and from conversation with Roman Catholics. Fr. Francis Woodlock, S.J., whose experience is very considerable, wrote on April 22nd, 1927, to the *Church of England Newspaper* (in whose correspondence columns the matter has been fully discussed):

> 'The majority of converts come to us from the Church of England, and there is no evidence that the majority of those who come are—to use "Lancashire's" delicate phrase—"converts through the flesh." *e.g.* Farm Street Register: 'Converts received 644; of these only 25 have been married subsequent to their reception.'

In the April 8th issue of the same newspaper Fr. Woodlock wrote: I was permitted to examine the file of applications for faculties sent to the Westminster diocesan authorities in 1924, and found that out of 1,345 converts received that year, no less than 1,147 came from the Established Church.'

Considering the steady advance of Romanizing teaching and practice in the Church of England, it is surprising that the figures are not larger. Although the Roman Church in England is extraordinarily active — here in Oxford we now have Jesuit, Benedictine, Dominican and Franciscan Halls, an Ursuline Convent, and a resident Roman Catholic chaplain to minister to undergraduates—yet it is not these agencies, but the activities of Anglicans, which are responsible mainly for the exodus to Rome. Where we are surrounded by evidence of this Anglican pro-Roman activity, it is not easy to select a single example. Those who desire inexpensive enlightenment might subscribe to *Ave*.[1]

[1] An Anglican quarterly edited by the Rev. Desmond Morse-Boycott, 33 Causton Road, Highgate, N. 6; annual subscription 1/6.

TWO RECENT LIVES OF CHRIST

By Lord Charnwood, Author of *Abraham Lincoln*, etc.

DR. BURKITT remarks in his Preface to Dr. Warschauer's volume,[1] 'to make a Portrait of Christ, each man for himself, is the duty of every Christian'; and though, as he adds, 'it cannot really be done second-hand,' we are generally helped by other men's diverse attempts to do the same. Probably it is always wiser not to call such an attempt a 'Life,' and not to pretend to that completeness and precision in unimportant matters at which a modern biography must aim, but which in this case is impossible and cannot be very seriously desired. We cannot expand such records as the Gospels so as to be sure how often, when, and why Jesus left Galilee, or know what every utterance that now puzzles us conveyed to its hearers at the time. Even the wish to do so may becloud in our minds the things, in a sense perhaps simple but of inexhaustible interest, which, when legend has been allowed for, and sources scrutinized, and dogma put on its trial, remain all the more impressive from the very bareness of those records. Yet even a *Life of Jesus* or a *Historical Life of Christ* must be welcomed when it is unaffectedly and reverently written, as are both these books.

Mr. Middleton Murry's book[2] is short and easy to read, if not always to understand. 'I wrote it,' he says, 'because I needed to write it.' He wrote it, moreover, with a burning conviction that the Jesus whose 'continued existence' is for him a fact which 'we cannot doubt' and cannot value too much 'would rather be denied by a true man than professed by a liar.' These things give his book a real charm. Perhaps the charm is greatest in the pages in which Mr. Middleton Murry exhibits his own intense apprehension of the 'mystery of the Kingdom,' that secret which lies open to 'the childlike, not the childish.' There is indeed a weakness in these pages; for, with his keen sense of what it means once to look on God as Father, our author pro-

[1] *The Life of Jesus*, by J. Middleton Murry. (Jonathan Capes, 1926.) Price 10/6.—*The Historical Life of Christ*, by Dr. J. Warschauer. (T. Fisher Unwin, 1927.) Price 15/-.

ceeds to impute to Jesus Christ an expectation that his revelation would completely and permanently transform the world in a 'catastrophic' manner. Now to the ordinary reader the impression of our Lord's great patience is irresistible; and in this inconsistent book (in spite of what is to be said below) Mr. Middleton Murry is generally happy in conveying his sense of the stupendous sanity of our Lord.

The conspicuous faults of the book are committed with a redeeming light-heartedness. Mr. Middleton Murry does not doubt that he has a theology to proclaim. He supposes 'devout Christians' to be blind to all those glorious human traits which he himself sees in our Lord. What blinds these devout Christians is a false doctrine, which he sums up in the formula 'the God-man.' That doctrine, he tells us, he discards for what he thinks the conclusive reason that he does not understand it. He is irresistibly and immediately impelled to substitute for it a reformed doctrine, for which the formula—and we hear no more about it—is 'the man-God.' The obvious retort of the devout Christian is that the one formula is neither more nor less intelligible than the other. This retort is unanswerable, and, since Mr. Middleton Murry is not really concerned with exact metaphysical enquiry, we may leave the matter there.

But he is out for history, and it is a pity that all his more novel conclusions are based on evidence which is manifestly insufficient. This applies to his excessive disparagement of the apostles, brothers and mother of our Lord (a circle of persons against whom all our evidence must be derived from their own self-reproach, while the evidence in extenuation is the fact that Christianity exists). It applies no less to his idealization of Mary Magdalene, and still more to the claim on the veneration of Christendom which he makes for Judas Iscariot. But what matters most is his treatment of the crowning event in the story. Jesus, we learn from him, died—and it was His greatness to do so—for an illusion. The illusion was that, though crucified, He would not really die at all, but that before His life was extinct some stupendous occurrence would come upon Him and the universe. Thus when He really did die it was in despair and disillusionment. Almost the only evidence given for the disillusionment and for the illusion is our Lord's recorded cry

upon the cross, in which He used the opening words of the 22nd Psalm (a Psalm which, as Dr. Warschaurer points out, should be read to its end). But Mr. Middleton Murry seems to see corroboration of his inference from this in the fact that our Lord had on a former occasion quoted a verse of the 118th Psalm, and the possibility that He may have thought of another verse of the same Psalm which He did not quote but which says 'I shall not die but live.' It is impossible to discuss this argument seriously.

Dr. Warschauer's book is not short, and it is not easy to read. It must have been very laborious to write, for it examines carefully almost every part of the Synoptic Gospels and much of the Fourth. Thus the student will find, inwoven with the main argument, a great deal of acute and sympathetic commentary on the Gospel text; and, for the sake of this, he may well be grateful to keep the book at hand. But Dr. Warschauer's purpose is to write a complete new history of Jesus which shall be true because it may be called 'Eschatological.' The 'Eschatological' view intended is of this sort: Our Lord taught and lived and died among people prone to excited expectations about great coming events in which a great coming personage might take a part; it is fundamental to an understanding of His story that we should recognize how He addressed Himself to these expectations and worked upon them, insisting that their fulfilment in some sense was close at hand; and not only is this so (which we must all at once admit), but, further, He adopted wholly a particular form which these expectations sometimes took, He cast Himself for a part which was sufficiently defined in the current talk of the expectant people, and His whole thought was permeated, and even dominated, by ideas which thus belong not to our time, nor to all time, but to His time. Dr. Warschauer, it must at once be added, is keenly aware of an eternal significance somehow involved in the ideas which he attributes to our Lord, but can get on comfortably by drawing a distinction between the substance and the form of our Lord's thought, which his readers may think obscure and fallacious.

Unfortunately for a man who will write history from any point of view, Dr. Warschauer is capable of writing thus: 'But

Jesus was in an exalted mood that evening (*Mark* vi, 35-44; *Matt.* xiv, 15-21; *Luke* x, 12-17; *John* vi, 5-13), a mood of buoyancy strongly contrasting with that in which He had set out, and owing its exaltation to the very fact that He had been addressing an eager and sympathetic audience, whose hearts He felt beating in unison with His own; and the suggestion of supper inspired Him with a thought which, however strange to us, was natural enough to Him at the time and under the circumstances.'

Now, if we ask what entitles Dr. Warschauer to display this benign familiarity with the passing moods of our Lord, it is at once evident that throughout this passage he is confidently chattering about a matter on which neither he nor anyone else knows anything whatsoever. And this is not mere padding such as used to be common in sermons; it is seriously used 'to add verisimilitude,' as one of Gilbert's characters says, 'to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative.' At point after point of his elaborate story—as to when and how and in what sense our Lord became convinced that He was to bring in the kingdom; now at a certain point 'Jesus readjusts and matures His plans'; how 'it is probable enough . . . that the non-appearance' of certain expected natural portents 'had caused Him no little anxiety'; how 'in a state of high religious fervour' He 'very possibly' reveals His character to His disciples in 'too sudden' a manner; how in any case Peter's confession was a breach of confidence and what 'mischief was done' thereby; how He came to Jerusalem to deliver 'a carefully-planned stroke "to accomplish His decease in Jerusalem"'; how His purpose was 'for the moment frustrated,' but ultimately achieved by a 'designedly undiscriminating diatribe,' etc., etc. —at most if not all of these vital points in his story Dr. Warschaurer's procedure is the same: it is not the employment of imaginative insight in directions in which there is something to be seen; it is sheer play of fancy unrelated to any real data.

It doesn't matter which point in the narrative we choose as an illustration of this. We may, however, take the point at which our Lord sent out the twelve upon their preaching mission. At this time, we learn from Dr. Warschauer, our Lord 'was expecting the consummation' (that is, the end of the world) 'in a

matter of weeks or months at most'; indeed, He probably expected it 'to coincide with the harvest which was even then ripening.' For the sole but sufficient evidence of this Dr. Warschauer refers us to *Mark* iv, from which he discards verses 10 to 20. Let the reader study the chapter, thus expurgated, and find the evidence, if he can.

A long 'Historical Life' constructed in this way of course does nothing to establish, and perhaps does little to refute, the sort of 'Eschatological' view which inspired it; but we cannot dismiss it without a few considerations on that view itself. Undoubtedly it is right to emphasize the importance in the Gospels of our Lord's appeal to current expectations of the future. Such a book as the *Book of Enoch*, now so often quoted and misquoted, was the product of a crazy brain, but it expressed a prevalent and persistent hope of 'some divine event towards which the whole creation moves,' which is vital to an understanding of Judaism, of Christianity, or of Christ. Moreover, our Lord's announcement of that event not as 'far off,' but as 'at hand,' demands study if we are ever to understand it. But in that study several cautions should be observed. The expectation of the future which prevailed was not a stereotyped *idée fixe*, but varied in different minds, and in all (save crazy minds) must have been fluid and fluctuating. It related—as surely our Lord's words did—not only (as the word 'eschatological' suggests) to an ultimate but also to a proximate future. If 'Apocalyptic' filled a large space in our Lord's mind and in those of His disciples, most certainly the Old Testament filled a very large space. In thought and speech on great matters there is (though Dr. Warschauer can strangely forget it) such a thing as poetry, and the Old Testament and the Gospels are peculiarly full of it. Lastly, no sensible man should study our Lord's words (any more than any other work of genius) without the sense that in all probability His thought at each point was larger, not smaller, than our own.

Now to turn to the leading idea of Dr. Warschauer's master, Schweitzer. Schweitzer has, by the way, a philosophy of his own about *Wille* and *Vorstellungen* which must be criticized before we follow him. But above all he is a heroic enthusiast. He is sick of a contented religion which resolves Jesus into a

mild sage; to him the ardent will simply to hasten the coming of the Kingdom is the whole spirit which was in Christ Jesus and must be in us. He is ready (as St. Paul sometimes seems almost ready) to impute folly to Christ if only that particular brand of folly may be Albert Schweitzer's also. It may be that in devotion and in exhortation this poetic mood has its occasional use. But at this point the cool, Epicurean sceptic, who lurks in most of us and who, maybe, has his uses too, rebels; and he will object on some such lines as the following: This is noble in a way, and is certainly above my level. I sincerely think Schweitzer must be a great man. Still it is plain upon the record (theology apart) that the historical Jesus was a much greater man. And as a matter of cold fact, the strain of what I should call 'folly,' which you are ready to attribute to Him, is just what seems most discordant with the deepest impression that the record makes on intelligent minds. Most intelligent men, when they are in a moral humour, have been apt to notice how, in what they do understand of Jesus, His balance was absolute, and how He 'hit the nail on the head' quite exactly. No doubt He did appeal to current 'apocalyptic' notions. But He appealed to other things too—to the Law and the Prophets and to current Rabbinical morality. To say that He was not deeply concerned with these things, that His moral teaching was an *Interimsethik*, is surely fantastic when one observes that in fact He vivified moral principle for all after times and traced the lines from which serious ethical thinkers have never since departed for long.

What was His method in this? In a paradoxical but really plain phrase He accepted current morality whole and transformed it altogether. Now we cannot really separate His ethics and His eschatology, for eschatology here means the Jewish national hope for the Jewish religion of righteousness. But, to make this abstraction for the moment, was His method with current eschatology different from His method with current ethics? Within the compass of the New Testament we see the conceptions of 'the Kingdom,' of 'the Christ,' of 'the Israel of God' and its relation to the world, utterly changing their meaning. The strange facts about our Lord's life and teaching which confront us in the Synoptic Gospels, and which it is hardest to

treat as unhistorical, can be most simply read as the record of one who was working this change. Is it reasonable to pretend that He did not know what He was doing? Science and the doctrine of the Incarnation would alike require us to regard our Lord's mind in relation to His mental circumstances. But neither sceptical history nor Christian devotion can long regard Him otherwise than as in a supreme degree master of all His circumstances.

A MODERNIST'S REFLECTIONS ON ELMER GANTRY

By the Reverend J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

READERS of *The Modern Churchman* will by this time have perused Mr. Sinclair Lewis's latest novel[1] for themselves or in any case have seen reviews of it in the Press. It is not our intention here to add one more to the number of such reviews, but rather to suggest certain reflections to which the book gives rise, and which may seem profitable to Modernists. Mr. Sinclair Lewis is himself, of course, no Modernist, though, to be sure, he is sufficiently modern. He clearly takes the view that religion is a survival from a more primitive epoch, and only flourishes to-day amongst the half-civilized, such as the more backward section of the population in the United States of America. If a Modernist is one who believes that there is nothing incompatible between Christianity and culture, Mr. Sinclair Lewis would repudiate the title.

The novel itself makes all this pretty clear. There are in the book three characters only for whom the author displays any respect. First, Jim Lefferts, a tough-minded agnostic undergraduate, comrade and room-mate to the hero before his conversion rendered him insufferable. Second, Dr. Zechlin, tutor at Mizpah Seminary, who, though now an atheist, 'went on as a Baptist preacher, as a teacher of ministerial cubs,' until he was abruptly retired, when he soon afterwards died. Third,

[1] *Elmer Gantry*, by Sinclair Lewis. (Jonathan Cape: 7/6 net.)

Frank Shallard, an American Robert Elsmere, who enters the Baptist ministry without any definite beliefs (his religion is a sort of survival of the memories of childhood, without visible rational basis), and is eventually set upon by a gang of Fundamentalist roughs, who render his face permanently unrecognizable and destroy his sight.

But if *Elmer Gantry* were nothing but a secularist tract, which presented us with a preacher who was a blackguard, and two or three atheists or agnostics who were angels of light, Modernists could well afford to neglect the book; but Mr. Sinclair Lewis has not gained his reputation by black and white artistry of this sort.

Mr. Sinclair Lewis in this book attempts to discredit religion, not by proving that its doctrines are false, but by showing that its basis is an uncritical emotionalism; and he seeks to show, further, that because it is emotional and not intellectual, its results are pernicious. But even more damaging is the suggestion, which every page of the book emphasizes, that Protestant Christianity in America is not only intellectually, but spiritually, bankrupt; which is by far the most serious charge of all. Even where the church is, upon the surface, a 'going concern,' run by a minister like Elmer with a genius for 'boost' and business-management, religion is dead. It has degenerated into sensationalism and sociability.

A considerable amount of review space has been devoted to Elmer's innumerable gallantries. No doubt the modern novelist is expected to introduce a plentiful supply of the improper, but Mr. Sinclair Lewis is not just playing to the gallery; he is working out a thesis. His theory is that the successful preacher must be an emotionalist. It is true that the emotionalist need not necessarily be immoral; but the probabilities are that he will be so if he specializes in revivalist preaching: for the same qualities which make him appealing and persuasive in religion, make him appealing and persuasive in love. A selection of these qualifications for success would be vanity, an itch for self-display, self-assurance, an effective voice, and above all great facility in evoking crowd-emotion and in being simultaneously carried away by it. The man with these gifts will carry all before him.

Of course the corollary is that emotional religion, with its revivals and ecstasies, is morally worthless. Elmer's own conversion, which has been most carefully staged, is represented as having about as much connection with moral reformation as an alcoholic debauch. As for the agent of this conversion, one Judson Roberts, he is a personality well worthy of close attention. He specialized in working upon the feelings of raw youths, and his methods were characterized by complete lack of reserve and of delicacy. He prevailed by genial muscularity and rant, mingled with judicious flattery of individuals. He was always 'very manly and jolly'; and an adept at making muscle and manliness compensate for spiritual and intellectual poverty. The type is not unknown even in England, and wears caped cassock and biretta more often than Judson's frock-coat. He had an infallible scent for secret sins, and took the same pleasure in them as a terrier does in a rat. He knew how to work the 'purity stunt' for all it was worth, and it is worth a good deal. 'Old Jud' was a great fellow in private, but on the revivalist platform, when the audience had been worked up by frenzied hymn-singing into a condition of hysteria, he was greater still. He was 'ecstatic—brimming with thrills.'

'He laughed, he shouted, he knelt and wept with real tears, he loved everybody, he raced down into the audience and patted shoulders, and for the moment everybody felt that he was closer to them than their closest friend.'

The scorn poured by Mr. Sinclair Lewis upon that singular type of Christianity styled 'muscular,' which is not unknown even in England, may surprise us. His point, we imagine, is that, as we reverence most those qualities which we lack, it is a decadent age which worships mere physical vigour. In the Middle Ages, when the general public was coarse, violent, reckless and cruel, there was no demand for the 'manly' type of clergyman. Friar Tuck was reckoned rather an eccentricity; priests were expected at least to profess asceticism, and there was a widespread attempt amongst them to practise it. It is true that there were bishops who could lead a charge of cavalry, using a heavy mace so as not to incur the guilt of shedding blood, but this was not reckoned as evidence of spiritual efficiency. But possibly Mr. Sinclair Lewis has a suspicion that these manly shepherds have

a feeling deep within them that there may be something feeble in their intellectual standpoint which calls for some sort of compensation in the way of a loud voice and a 'hearty' manner. After all, it is well known that it is only the effeminate people who like to be thought manly, as it is the weakling who longs to be thought muscular. 'Manliness' is often a popular disguise to cover a cowardly obscurantism.

Whether or no Mr Sinclair Lewis attributes religious decadence to popular control, he certainly regards the two as concomitants. Popular control of religious institutions has, of course, gone to far greater lengths in America than in England, though in this respect, since the Enabling Act, we are following the American lead (though, to be sure, our system of endowments makes the clergy tolerably free from full control by the ignorant). Mr. Sinclair Lewis nowhere sees anything but a steady demand for sensationalism and sentiment, and the cruder the better. For anything arduous, whether in the way of intellectual or moral effort, he finds no demand whatever. Whether his diagnosis applies equally well over here, the present writer is not bold enough to say. The point is one of importance for Modernists, many of whom are inclined greatly to over-estimate the numbers and influence of the intelligent laity. It is at any rate an interesting fact that the bulk of the opposition to the new Prayer-Book comes from the laity, who are more ignorant of the issues involved than are the clergy. It is at least probable that there is to-day in the Church of England a descending order of liberalism and enlightenment: bishops, clergy, laity.

Elmer Gantry is certainly a most pessimistic book, but a certain amount of encouragement may be derived from it by Modernists, otherwise it would not have been worth while to write this article. The encouragement may be distilled from the fact that America is a country where popular fads can be 'tried out,' as the phrase goes, without misgivings. In England we can only bring ourselves to try a new 'stunt' half-heartedly; we are too self-conscious and uncertain of ourselves. The consequence is that certain religious methods have to wait for American experiment until they can be proved worthless. What Mr. Sinclair Lewis's latest book seems to prove (assuming that

he gets anywhere near the truth) is that mere emotionalism in religion is not merely useless but pernicious. Better, almost, to have no religion at all. For, as Professor Whitehead has recently reminded the American public, 'In considering religion, we should not be obsessed by the idea of its necessary goodness. This is a dangerous delusion. The point to notice is its transcendent importance.[2]

A certain number of people are deriving satisfaction from the fact that it is popular Protestantism which is satirized in *Elmer Gantry*, Baptists, and Methodists, and 'New Thought,' and all the rest of it. Now though we would not willingly rob anyone of a possible consolation, we shall take leave to say clearly, what we have already hinted at, that Protestantism, American or English, has no monopoly of mere religious emotionalism. And if it be said that religious emotion is in itself no crime, we shall certainly agree; religion devoid of emotion would not be religion at all. But there are certain types of religion, Catholic as well as Protestant, of which it may be said that they are not 'morality tinged with emotion,' but emotion tinged, and often very faintly tinged, with morality.[3] And this sort of religion does more harm than good.

And if we are asked to indicate some ideal of religion quite different in kind to this, we should suggest a return to Clement of Alexandria and Christian Platonism. We should give the primacy in man's nature to the intelligence, and not to the passions. In short, we venture to refer our readers to the Second Chapter in Archdeacon Lilley's admirable book, *Prayer in Christian Theology*. If they have been reading *Elmer Gantry*, they will certainly want something of this sort to wash their minds clean.

[2] *Religion in the Making*, p. 18.

[3] I owe this epigram to my friend, the Rev. A. D. Phillips.

GEORGE TYRRELL AND FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL IN THEIR RELATION TO CATHOLIC MODERNISM*

By Miss M. D. Petre, author of *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell.*

In preparing this paper the first difficulty I encountered arose from my very nearness to the question of which I was to treat. One can know a subject too little; one can also know it too well to speak of it clearly and objectively. My own life was knitted in with the careers and fortunes of those two men, and of them especially, as in a lesser degree, of others associated with them, I might say:

E più d'onore assai mi fenno,
Ch'essi mi fecer della loro schiera,
Si ch'io fui sesto fra cotanto senno.

I may fail, therefore, to present such an objective account of their lives and thoughts as might be furnished by one who studied them from outside; but I must only hope that what my discourse lacks in definiteness and outline it may atone for in warmth and life.

If I may quote the honoured and central figure of this Congress, M Loisy, I should like to recall some words of a letter he wrote to me when I sent him my little work on Modernism: he said he always felt, when this subject was recalled, as though someone was 'fiddling with his ashes' (*remuait ses cendres*)!

I am willing to adopt the same expression, only adding that, when I stir the ashes of that past crisis, the flames still burst from it, and the blaze of those heroic days seems to me more bright and intense than any fire that has been kindled since then. Thus I betray myself at the outset, and show you that the subject before me is, to me, no merely intellectual problem, but a question of life and death.

I shall be true to the subject appointed by the programme in confining myself to a study of the thought and work of Tyrrell and von Hügel as displayed in the Modernist contro-

*Paper read in French at the Congress for the Jubilee of M. Loisy at the College de France, April 19th to 22nd.

versy and movement. Indeed, I may say that in this movement both men found the culminating task and interest of their lives —their *vocation*, to use that word in its strictly Catholic and religious sense.

I know that much effort has been made, since his death, to detach the name and memory of von Hügel from that movement; I know that, in his own words and actions since the death of his friend Tyrrell, much justification might be found for this attempt. But I am in no wise moved by these facts. I remain of the opinion that I expressed in an article on von Hügel, after his death, that he was not only essentially Modernist, but arch-Modernist, and the original leader of the cause in England. And as to a certain reaction which can, undoubtedly, be noted in his later mental attitude, unless that reaction was productive of some fresh line of thought, it cannot be said to alter his life-work, his philosophy, nor the essential characteristics of his religious thought. We find, amongst his later utterances, certain repudiations of positions which he regarded as extreme or incorrect, but he was always, even in full tide of battle, essentially moderate, correct, and cautious.

But, on the other hand, I do not think that, in his constructive work of that later period, you can find any change of attitude, any 'conversion' from that Modernism which was of the essence of his religion and philosophy; and I think you could find many remarks and statements as deserving of orthodox censure as those which could be drawn from his own earlier or any of Tyrrell's works. That he was never condemned is one of those puzzles which may never be solved, though I have my own suspicion of the actual solution.

So much as regards the essential connection of von Hügel with Modernism. And now as regards Tyrrell. I may surprise my hearers by saying that, though he lived for Modernism and though he died in it—and, to some extent, of it—it was not with him so essential and inevitable a destiny as it was with von Hügel; he might, under other circumstances, have lived outside it; he was compelled to enter the lists by the pressure of religious tyranny, by the call of loyalty to religious friends and leaders; by the impossibility of devoting himself in peace to his own line of thought and action while others were standing in

the fighting line. Thus teachers, doctors, men of letters, during the Great War, felt that no work of theirs, however great and important, could absolve them from joining their fellow-countrymen in the trenches.

I must explain my meaning more fully. Of course Tyrrell would have continually found himself up against acts and decisions of authority that impeded his teaching and thought. At the very beginning of his career he was blamed for his treatment of the doctrine of eternal punishment But what I mean by my contrast between the two men on this point is that von Hügel was, by his earliest studies, brought into contact with the chief problems that Modernism had to face, and that, by his whole temper of mind, he was drawn to the study and consideration of the intellectual value and position of religion in regard to universal knowledge and thought.

Tyrrell, on the other hand, was primarily sacerdotal and apostolic in character; his interest in human life was even greater than his interest in human thought; he was possessed, above all, by the needs of the human soul, its need for a spiritual sanction, a spiritual end, a spiritual beyond, a spiritual God. In his *Autobiography* he has told us, with the unsparing truthfulness of an Augustine, how he faced the two extremes of sense and spirit, and how he came to the conclusion that, to use his later words, nothing mattered at all unless it mattered eternally.

Hence it is conceivable that, in other times, under other circumstances, Tyrrell might have spent his life as a spiritual and ascetical teacher, preacher, and director; it was under the impulse of other minds—at first and mainly that of von Hügel—that he turned to the consideration of those problems of history and science which drew him into the Modernist movement; and it was in virtue of his essential truth and loyalty that, once embarked on the stormy sea, he was willing to suffer shipwreck, but not to take refuge on any land but the promised one.

And now, having stated what I believe to be the respective parts of von Hügel and Tyrrell in Modernism, I will turn to the question of what Modernism is—or was—the Modernism to which our programme refers—'*un Modernisme de Catholiques croyants*.'

I do not know that von Hügel ever gave a definition of it; in his last work, *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, Tyrrell gives the following:

> 'By a Modernist I mean a Churchman, of any sort, who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of modernity.'

My own description of it, drawn from my little book, *Modernism, its Failure and its Fruits*, is as follows:

> 'It is a movement in the Church, but not a Church movement; and it is a movement not in one Church only, but in all.
>
> It is a religious movement, yet the official representatives of religion repudiate it; it is a deeply human movement, yet the larger section of humanity cares nothing for it.
>
> It is a learned movement, yet learning regards it more frequently with pity than with respect; it is an unlearned movement, yet the unlearned look on it with fear and suspicion rather than love.
>
> It is a persecuted movement, but its martyrs get little honour or sympathy; it is a defeated movement, yet it is still dreaded and reviled.
>
> Modernism is, then, essentially a religious movement, though certain non-religious elements have made common cause with it; and it is also a religious movement within the Churches, though its human sympathies spread beyond them. In this way the Modernist becomes one who believes, not only in the possibility of a synthesis between modernity and religion, but also in the possibility of a synthesis between modern religion and the Church.'

Now when Modernism first arose—if it ever did arise, for, in my opinion, it is indigenous to religion of every time and every place—but when Modernism as represented by von Hügel, Tyrrell, and their fellow-workers arose, on what points was such a synthesis chiefly required? Why just then? And who were those on whose behalf it was specially needed?

First of all, why just then? One of those questions which cannot be fully answered. All we know is that there come moments, in the life of a community as in the life of an individual, when neglected facts and truths become suddenly insistent, and when, after looking at a thing for a long time, we suddenly exclaim 'I see!' Of course, numbers of us had felt restless for a long time, perhaps all our lives, but somehow there came a moment of collective apprehension.

Secondly, on what points was such a synthesis chiefly needed?

There was, first of all, the historical problem, that unsolved problem of every religion that has for its centre any fact or person of human history.

As I have often said and felt, this problem is of a peculiarly painful character to the traditional Christian believer, for it affects both worship and prayer, and it is both worship and prayer which are the main constituents of every spiritual religion.

I am not ashamed to say that many devout believers would gladly turn their heads away from the consideration of this problem; and that those who resist such an inclination, while clinging to their faith in the teaching of Christianity, have to become acquainted with spiritual suffering in a very acute form.

I strongly suspect that even the weight of ecclesiastical authority would not have sufficed to subdue the mass of the faithful, as it did on the occasion of the well-known condemnations of Modernism, had it not been for the universal dread of any encroachment of historical criticism on traditional faith: and the historical problem has remained so prominent and acute that, in others than the Roman Catholic Church, it has come to be regarded as the essential question of Modernism.

But there were and are others.

There was a social Modernism, of which France had a noble representative in the person of M. Marc Sangnier: of which Prof. Murri was the Italian protagonist.

Without entering on a discussion of democracy and socialism we may say that. in substance, the question asked by the Catholic social Modernist was whether the Church was irrevocably bound up with the existing and set forms of human society, or whether she could admit of such changes, as human nature might desire and conceive, in the interests of the proletariat; whether, in fact, social miseries and disadvantages were to be treated as matter for Christian charity, or human justice. The answer of the Modernist to this question was in the affirmative and in favour of the second alternative.

There was, again, a scientific and philosophical Modernism, of which I need not speak separately, since it is closely connected with the historical form.

There was also a theological Modernism, which dealt with the question of the relation of dogma to faith, of the right use and limits of theology; and which came into contact with the vital question of the rights and limits of religious authority.

I have often wished that Modernism had concentrated its forces, more than it did, on this last problem, which surely lay at the base of all the rest in their relation to the Church.

Lastly, on whose behalf did the Modernist movement arise?

It is obvious to all that Modernism was a movement on behalf of the learned; it is not so obvious that it was also a movement on behalf of the ignorant—but this it most assuredly was. And it is on this side that Tyrrell was, as I should like presently to show, chiefly active.

It must not be supposed that the simple faithful, who make no study of historical, or scientific, or theological problems, are therefore uniformly happy and contented with doctrine as presented to them. There is many a struggle which goes on—unseen by the world at large—within the devout soul, for whom the teaching and sacraments of the Church are the essential means of spiritual life, and for whom, nevertheless, there are elements in that teaching repugnant to its noblest senses and convictions. Such as these I once classified as the unlearned Modernists, and their need was, perhaps, even greater than that of the learned.

And now I should like to say that, in analysing the respective contributions of von Hügel and Tyrrell to the religious thought of their time—which was the time of the Modernist crisis—I am saying, in perfect simplicity, what I myself think, and I leave it to the judgment of those who listen to me to confirm or dispute my opinion. Both men were my personal friends, and to the last; though eventually I diverged, to some extent, from the one who outlived the other. Although both of them were leaders in a way that I was not; although for both of them I cherished sentiments of reverence as well as love; I do not think that my closeness to either of them weakened my power of criticism, which I possess to an extent which is much too great for my own comfort.

Von Hügel.

To take von Hügel first.

He was, in those early days, the master and leader of us all. Full of faith, a faith won and preserved at the cost of much suffering; full of learning and knowledge; he was the bond of

union between thinkers and students of several countries; and he had a rare gift of friendship and sympathy. He was one of those whose mere existence seems to count for something in one's life.

I should classify him as a comprehensive, rather than an original, thinker; one whose faculties were synthetic rather than intuitive.

His work and thought might be divided under two main headings, that of history and that of mysticism—both in their relation to religion.

I take it that he would not be regarded as a pioneer in the field of Biblical criticism, but he was one of the pioneers in regard to its acceptance by Catholicism as a legitimate subject of knowledge and discussion.

It was M. Loisy who exercised the greatest influence over him in the earliest days of the Modernist movement, and it was typical of him that, as he was always wont to make of his latest attained convictions the touchstone of other minds, so, at that time, the test proposed to all of us was belief in the sound scholarship of M. Loisy.

His attitude to the historical problem of Christianity was in harmony with his whole religious philosophy—he ever maintained that religion should be regarded as life's highest interest, but not as its sole interest; that its supremacy in no way implied any interference in other fields of life and truth. Hence he insisted on the autonomy of history and criticism in their own domain. Along with others he attempted to reach some solution of the Christological problem that should harmonize with the central doctrine of Christianity; hence his article 'Du Christ Éternel et de nos Christologies successives' in the *Quinzaine* of June 1st, 1904. The main idea of this article was the relation of the Fourth Gospel, with its doctrine of the spiritual significance of Christ, to the Synoptics, with their history of His earthly career.

I do not know of any direct attempt to deal with this question in his later work, and I think it must be admitted that, on his own grounds, and having regard to his own main principle of the independent rights of science and history, that problem remained unsolved.

As I have said elsewhere:

All the other problems of Modernism were manageable in comparison with this one . . . for herein it was the very central object of worship whose nature was being called in question. It was vain to tell us that the Christ of our faith and adoration was independent of the Christ with whom critics were dealing. We knew quite well, every one of us, that the Christ of faith was also the Jesus Christ of history, and that we were being offered a symbol in place of an historic reality.

We cannot say what the future may beget in the advance of criticism, in the justification of faith, but I think we can say that, on this point, Christian apologists have not completed their task. Meanwhile, for myself, the only answer is that we cannot separate Christ, as object of worship, from the Church in which He is incorporated, and the very perversity of ecclesiastical authority, which has ever condemned more energetically apologetic criticism than criticism itself, marks, perhaps, a true instinct in the matter.

The Church knew instinctively that there were elements of her doctrine which could not bear the test of criticism, because they were not intended to bear that test; she had a subconscious, though certainly not a conscious, sense of the relativity, the temporal limitations, the symbolism of her own teaching.

I should go much beyond the limits of this address were I to attempt a full discussion of von Hügel's treatment of mysticism; therefore a few words must suffice.

Here again we have his characteristic plea for the right of every form of experience to express itself, and we have fine proof of his critical power as applied to various forms of mysticism. We have his well-known principle of the three-fold character of religion; we have his determined restriction of the laws of each department of life to its own subject.

But we have, in all his treatment of this subject, that predominating quality of moderation which, to my mind, ever saved him from disaster, but also saved him—if the word may be used—from intellectual and spiritual heroism. And I cannot but think that moral moderation and intellectual caution are obstacles to the full understanding of the mystical temperament, or, at any rate, to any participation in the same.

Von Hügel was shy of such men as John of the Cross; he would have been still more shy of Bunyan, with his fingers pressed in his ears as he 'ran on, crying Life! Life! Eternal Life!'

These were extremists, indeed, but is it not the extremists who 'discover'? Shall we ever find what lies outside the world without stepping off its edge? It took some courage, and a great lack of caution, to discover that our own world had another side.

On the whole I cannot but think that von Hügel was greater in his personality than in his actual intellectual achievements. To know him was to know one whose knowledge was as massive as his faith, and in whom both were co-ordinated to a spiritual end. He was a great inspirer of mind and soul within and without the Church to which he belonged, and his work probably lives on in his disciples even more than in his written words.

Tyrrell.

No two men could have been more unlike than Tyrrell and von Hügel, who were friends to the last in spite of many differences. They had it, however, in common that both of them had passed through an early phase of agnosticism, and both had, also experienced the pull of the lower nature, had been impelled, partly thereby, to seek, like Augustine, for a motive that could inspire them in the battle of sense and spirit, and render the final victory of the second worth all their efforts.

I think we could sum up Tyrrell's attitude to life and its moral struggles in his oft used words, that nothing mattered much that did not matter eternally. And when he said this he was inspired by extraordinarily little regard for his own personal welfare, here or hereafter; for his indifference to his own fate was such as I, personally, have never met with in anyone else. It almost amounted to a vice, for it was the root cause of his extraordinary recklessness, and of many injudicious words and actions. Along with this, and contributory to much misunderstanding of his life and character, was that Celtic spirit of mockery; a mockery which was, in his case, chiefly directed against himself, and against his own, even most serious, efforts. I do not think that the French ought to have as much difficulty in

understanding this type as the English, for there is in it surely something of the *esprit Gaulois*—that quality in virtue of which a man can mock at his own beliefs even while believing. It is a quality of intellectual detachment which is, of course, the essence of every form of humour.

When Tyrrell turned from the world of sense and matter, and sought some form of life in which the aspirations of the higher life might be realized, he found the Catholic Church as what seemed to him the best home for his efforts, the best means to his end. Throughout his short and tragic career he clung to this Church for the same reason that he entered it. He had no illusions; he experienced the worst of it; he often spoke as though he saw nothing else but its vices and drawbacks. But he died in it for the same reason that he lived in it.

As a priest he came quickly into touch with souls, and their needs, and I think we may say that his Modernism was, above all, pastoral and apostolic in character. He himself maintained that his early article on 'The relation of theology to devotion' was the nucleus of all his later work, and that article was an appeal for the rights of the devout mind against the intellectualism of theology. He was endlessly tolerant of even the narrow orthodoxy of the simple, though not of the *bourgeois* orthodoxy of those whose faith consists in a sureness that they are right and others wrong. *Lex orandi, lex credendi*—this was the substance of his teaching.

In his treatment of the Christological problem his aim was to save the spiritual value of the personality of Christ; to preserve the force and value of Christian prayer.

He had, what I have maintained that von Hügel had not, the mystical temperament, with its intuitiveness, its daring, its lack of caution. He worked as one driven, as he himself once said to me:

I am always hurried to get things in before death overtakes me. . . . Could I feel secure of a year . . . but I always think it may be in a week.

His work was his fate; he could have enjoyed peace, friendship, study, prayer, nature; but he was ever in the firing line, almost against his will.

In his last work, *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, as I said

in the Introduction, he occupied himself, as in no other of his books, *with the question of immortality; with an examination of the value of this life, a study of its relations to the next.*

And his verdict is uncompromising. No ideal that is capable of realization in this world is capable of appeasing the heart of man, whose hunger is for a transcendent kingdom ruled by a transcendent God. Something more and something greater than all that life, under its present conditions, can offer; something after which we grope, without seeing it; something for which we long without comprehending it; something which will explain us to ourselves as no human wisdom can explain us; this is what religion is to stand for if it be religion at all, and not merely a scheme of philosophy however enlightened.

The Church had, for Tyrrell, no importance save as the shrine and ark of such faith. His Modernism was inspired by the passionate desire to see her rise to the fulfilment of her task; to induce her to open her doors to those who had a full right to enter, and were kept outside by her claims to false dominion over lands that did not belong to her.

* * * * *

To conclude by a contrast between these two men. As I said elsewhere, von Hügel was almost surely a saint, but very surely not a martyr; Tyrrell, on the contrary, was not very surely a saint, but was most assuredly a martyr, and the blood of the martyrs!

And now what shall I say? These two men came into full and merciless contact with all that science and history and human reason can adduce against the faith they cherished—they held firm to that faith, and, what is more strange, to the Church in which it was incorporated.

Why? Did they shut their eyes and refuse to see? Was there any personal calculation, any sophistry, any cynicism in their attitude? Surely not—and none who read them, or knew them, could think it.

They knew the difficulties—they felt all the precariousness of faith—but they believed also, and firmly believed, that spiritual values are the only abiding ones, that religion is the supreme interest of mankind, that Christianity is its highest message, and that there was no better form of religion than that in which

they found themselves. They claimed, or certainly Tyrrell claimed, no finality in their solution, but they did claim to have found a way of life, a path that the human soul might follow in its course from birth to death.

To have claimed finality would have been, indeed, to embrace a spectre. Never has human life changed more rapidly than during the last years, and new light may yet be shed upon our whole destiny. But nothing can alter the radical aspirations of the human heart, and it was for these that the Modernist contended, and for the sake of which he endured the cramping torture of ecclesiastical institutions, because, in spite of their limitations, he found in them a support in the passage through this dark and troubled life; he found, through them, the grace to live, the courage to die.

THE PLACE OF THE MIND IN RELIGION*

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . . and with all thy mind.'—*Mark* xii, 30.

FEW novels, written since 1914, have presented such a wholesomely ghastly picture of the horror and filth of modern warfare as Mr. C. E. Montague's *Rough Justice*, published in 1926. But I do not wish to dwell on that subject now. The book has running through it a fearlessly outspoken, though sincerely religious, thread of criticism of orthodox Christianity from which I want to choose two fragments to point our thought this morning.

The first is when the hero, Auberon Garth, is ten years old. He goes to church for the first time since his christening. 'Why not sooner?' asks the author. 'Because his father had religion alive and aflame in himself and did not want his son rendered incapable of winning that treasure. So he had not let the child be drilled from the first to repeat things which, if they are uttered at all, ought to rise to the lips like insuppressible cries

*Sermon preached at St. Andrew's, Ashley Place, S.W.1, at the Corporate Celebration of the Churchmen's Union on May 25th, 1927, by the Rev. Kenneth Luce, M.A., Master of the King's Scholars in Westminster School.

of love and grief.' The boy's heart is open to every new emotion. The Rector of Gistleham—his uncle—climbed the pulpit stairs and gave out a piece of terrible news—no doubt, Bron felt, because so many people were all together and might help at once. It was a rending tale of some kind and brave man ferociously hurt a long time ago and feeling a dreadful pain, even now, because there was something not done which he wanted them all to do for him. Bron wept beside Nurse in the family pew. But people seemed to be strangely traquil. Instead of rushing out to help they sang another hymn, quite slowly: and afterwards they walked away from the church as though nothing remarkable had happened and nothing had to be done. Nurse, when anxiously questioned, only said 'we must not take things too much to heart—people would think us so odd if we did.'

The second is twelve years later, on the day war is declared. The stir of the time has broken down the natural reserve between Auberon and his father—they are talking of God and Christ and the coming war. 'I do believe I've loved Christ,' says Auberon; 'whatever He said seems to grow into being a bit of yourself, till you can't make up your mind what to do in anything big without thinking first "If I should do this would Christ bar me?"— but a lot of the rest—I can't even feel that it matters. It seems to let Him down—making out as it were that all the lovely, noble things He said would not count for so much if He had been born the usual way and His body had lain still when He died.'

Our subject to-day is Religious Education. And I believe that the two passages that I have summarized for you contain the key of the problem as it faces us to-day. Reality, and freedom from dogmatic barriers—those, it seems, must be the conditions of progress in winning for Christ the young men and women of to-day. Let me go on to examine this in greater detail: and before doing so let me explain that I have in mind boys and girls, and young men and women, of that class of which alone I have had any considerable experience—the children of the more or less well-to-do, who pass from preparatory to public schools, and thence to business or the university.

First, then, how are we to secure reality in our presentation of religion? How are we to avoid the feeling that Christianity

often does not mean what it says, and in any case has nothing to do with real life? Let me put four points before you—familiar enough, I expect, but needing emphasis to-day.

(1) In a child's early years, what it is *not* taught is of the greatest importance. I mean that it is often better that the child should be taught nothing at all about religion than that it should be taught a great deal that will later have to be unlearned. People talk glibly about the need for fairy tale to appeal to the child's mind, and the easy readjustment that can be effected as the mind becomes more critical. I fancy that in many cases such teaching is followed, not by readjustment, but recoil. I suppose any parents worthy of the name will wish their child to learn by experience to trust implicitly the truth of what they tell him. Such a trust forms a wonderfully close bond between parents and child, and I cannot feel that matters of religion should be allowed to be exceptions to this rule. We are gradually learning, for instance, that in sexual matters complete frankness is the only sane, and the only safe, method of education. I am convinced that it is so also with religion.

(2) This point I can only state in a few sentences and leave there. Each individual teacher of Christianity must study and elaborate it for himself. It is that the figure of the human Jesus must be central in our teaching, and the figure we present must be real and strong. The bogey God invoked to strike terror into the naughty child, and the 'gentle Jesus, meek and mild,' of nursery picture books are the Scylla and Charybdis of our teaching. We must steer our ship watchfully between them. The Jesus of our picture must be able to say 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father' as well as 'Suffer the little children to come unto Me.'

(3) A great deal of progress has been made recently in the matter of which I have been speaking—both in getting rid of unworthy ideas of God and emphasizing the real humanity of Jesus. I am sure that the results of this progress are beginning to be felt in the increased respect for Christianity which is evident at our public schools and universities. But there is still much to be done in making it clear that the Church feels, as Auberon felt in Gistleham church, that Jesus 'has something that He wants them all to do for Him.' We shall only achieve

this by insisting in all our teaching that the aim of it all is the Christian life; that we want to know what Jesus thought and said and did in order that we may try to deal in His spirit with the problems of our everyday life. In one way in particular I feel that Christian preaching and teaching is often too narrow. We are ourselves obsessed by what Mr. Peck has called in the current *Modern Churchman* 'a false dualism between the religious and the secular,' and we unconsciously assume that it was so with Jesus: that is to say, we fail to assert with unceasing emphasis, the truth central to His experience, that religion is not a department of life, but greater than life; that all life is religion. This leads to the error of the Pharisees; the idea that God may best be pleased by the performance of certain ecclesiastical actions: it leads to the error of interpreting many of Jesus' sayings in a too narrowly ecclesiastical sense, as though Jesus' mind moved within the limit of a cloister: it leads to the error of not recognizing that the penetrating mind of Jesus could not fail to occupy itself with the great problems of social and international life that are at bottom the same for our age as for His; and that therefore it is not only the right but the *duty* of the Church to put before the world as plainly as she may what she believes to be the Christian point of view on all the tragic perplexities and discords of modern life. The Coal Strike, Disarmament, China—on all these perplexing problems there is the Christian point of view: it is our duty as Christians to search for it and, if we find it, make it plainly heard.

(4) We must press unremittingly for more reality in the official literature of the Church. Let me mention two points in particular here which affect the presentation of religion to the young. First, the hymns we use—a part of our service which appeals tremendously to boys and girls—when, alas, so rarely, good poetry and good music are combined. Is a really 'modern' hymn-book an impossibility? Or why is it so slow to come? Secondly, Confirmation. In this service, which ought to be, and could be, the rallying point of young Christians eager for action and adventure, I would plead for the complete recasting of the whole thing. In preparation, as well as in the service itself—and the one will, in most cases, take its tone from the other—we need the emphasis laid on the offering of the life to

God for His work in the world, rather than on submission to the operation of a sacramental grace. A service in simple, modern language, of which the keynote is self-giving for God's work, would be a tremendously valuable asset to the Church in appealing to the young. I will say a little more on this matter later.

I have left only a few minutes in which to speak of the second main point to which I drew your attention at the beginning—the need for freedom from dogmatic barriers. I do not think that this means that we have got our perspective wrong, for though the need for dogmatic freedom is no less pressing than the need for reality, I have no doubt that most of those to whom I am speaking do not need to be convinced or even reminded of its value. To most Modernists, certainly to myself, it is far less hard to try to love God with the mind than with the heart. So I will content myself with putting before you three considerations of importance from the teacher's point of view—particularly at a public school.

(1) The vital necessity is that boys and girls should be taught that with regard to intellectual belief the one essential thing is to think and to go on thinking: that it is not a question of being forced to accept once and for all certain partly understood dogmatic statements without the acceptance of which it is impossible to be a Christian: but that the Christian's duty is to build up his own belief as experience and study lead him, and continually to criticize and revise. Such doctrines as the Miraculous Birth and the Empty Tomb fall then into their rightful place, not as barriers to belief but as stimulants to study.

(2) It is imperatively important for the future of Christianity in England that the Church herself should authorize and encourage this freedom of thought of which I have just been speaking. As things are, many young people think that the Church is antagonistic to honest enquiry—that she is afraid of the consequences of honest thinking. In the revised Prayer Book, for instance, practically no account has apparently been taken of the results of the New Testament criticism of the last half-century. Many teachers who freely encourage their pupils towards critical study of the Bible and Christian doctrine have an uneasy feeling (I speak from experience) that the official

Church eyes them askance as dangerous disturbers of her dignified repose. Such a teacher finds it his hardest task—and the folly of it all is heart-breaking—to persuade those whom he teaches, who hold, as it seems to him, a firm belief in the essentials of Christianity, that there is still a place for them within the Church. I must confess that in not a few cases I find the task impossible.

(3) The Church must help us to help her in this matter. A very much shorter and simpler creed would be a tremendous help. The complicated result of a long process of exclusion of heretics fifteen or sixteen hundred years ago is hardly suitable as the expression of a boy or girl's faith and loyalty to-day. By careful explanation, of course, its meaning and the right way to interpret it for the thought of our own time can be made clear to the more intelligent. To the less intelligent it must remain unintelligible: and surely a creed ought not to puzzle but to inspire.

I want to conclude with a suggestion about Confirmation which I have not seen put forward elsewhere. I am quite sure that for educated boys and girls even the later usual age for Confirmation, fourteen or fifteen, is too early—eleven or twelve, of course, is simply foolish—too early, that is, from the intellectual point of view. I believe that many men will confess that they have deeply resented what they have come to regard as an attempt to trick them into assenting to a definite system of belief at an age when they were quite unable to judge it impartially for themselves. The argument will at once be brought forward on the other side that it is wrong to deprive a boy or girl of the moral stimulus of Confirmation and the benefits of the Communion Service during very critical years. I entirely agree. If I were the headmaster of a public school and could get my Bishop's permission—which would no doubt be impossible in nine cases out of ten—I would have a 'service of admission to Holy Communion' for boys in their first or second term at school, preceded by simple instruction on the Communion Service, morals generally and sex. Confirmation I would reserve until a boy's last term at school, and preparation for it would take months, not weeks. It would be a real dedication of mind as well as heart to God's service, undertaken with the greatest possible realization of its seriousness. At first Confirmation

candidates might be only half as many under this system as they are now: but is it not the case that to even more than fifty per cent. of our candidates to-day Confirmation five years afterwards is but the memory of a childish enthusiasm?

What are we to do in the meantime? For I am quite aware that what I have just suggested is hardly likely to be seriously considered at present. When boys and girls come to us to be prepared for Confirmation we must, as things are, stress most the side of moral effort: on the intellectual side we must simplify, restate, re-interpret, and above all we must make it clear that it is to intellectual activity, not immobility, that the candidate is pledging himself. And we must do all we can in after years to guide him forward on his path towards truth.

IN MEMORIAM

ALFRED HAMILTON CRUICKSHANK, M.A., D.Litt.

It is not an easy thing to express adequately all that one would wish to say about the friend and colleague who has so recently been taken from our midst. There were so many sides to his most attractive personality. His influence on our Durham life has been gracious and kindly. It is well known that he was a fine scholar, with an absorbing interest in the Greek and Latin classics to the study and teaching of which his life has been so fully given. But he was also a keen student of English literature. It was during the prolonged dark days of the war that he worked more particularly at the writings of Massinger—to secure some sort of distraction from the troubles of the time.

He had a living interest, too, in the details of our local municipal life. In this he was somewhat the leader of forlorn hopes, or, at any rate, of difficult projects. He gladly associated himself with anything that seemed like a measure of reform or of social amelioration.

His enjoyment of life was rich and varied. Possibly it was this fact that, in part at any rate, accounted for the geniality and kindness that simply radiated from his personality. Not only the inner circle of his friends, but the wider one of University students and fellow-citizens, learned to look for his winning smile and ready wit.

The Cathedral was, in a very real sense, to him a centre of his religious life, and through his own musical knowledge and capacity he was able to enter with special understanding and interest into its musical services.

As a Christian and a Churchman he was a glad and avowed Modernist, and was wont, on occasions, to say so explicitly. The branch of the Churchmen's Union in Durham has had a somewhat struggling existence, but Canon Cruickshank was a pillar of the little society. He always thought it well worth keeping alive, and was always unfalteringly hopeful about its future.

D. Dawson-Walker.

The College,
Durham.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGION IN THE MAKING*

Dr. Whitehead, in his latest book, traces the growth of religion in the history of mankind, offers a new religious metaphysic, and adds certain reflections upon the present religious situation. Following much recent anthropology, Dr. Whitehead regards ritual as prior to myth. Ritual is intended primarily to stimulate emotion, and the ritual-emotional complex is interpreted in terms of myth. The next stage is the rationalising of myth and ritual. This stage, however, cannot be reached until the power of dealing with general ideas has been developed, and this is a late acquirement. Furthermore, in so far as general ideas isolate their possessor from the immediacy of experience, and place him in an environment of universals, the religious rationalist stands very much alone.

'The great religious conceptions which haunt the imaginations of civilised mankind are scenes of solitariness: Prometheus chained to his rock, Mahomet brooding in the desert, the meditations of the Buddha, the solitary Man on the Cross. It belongs to the depth of the religious spirit to have felt forsaken, even by God.'

Such being the order of development, it is possible to pronounce certain contemporary religious phenomena as survivals or reversions to type—Atavism in religion is displayed in an irrational emotionalism, in mere sociability, and in that tribal cult common to 'emotional statesmen, captains of industry, and social reformers.' Primitive forms of religion display a singular vitality and a liability to recur, and are no blessing to the human race.

'History is a melancholy record of the horrors which can attend religion: human sacrifice, and in particular the slaughter of children, cannibalism, sexual orgies, abject superstition, hatred as between races, the maintenance of degrading customs, hysteria, bigotry, all can be laid to its charge. Religion is the last refuge of human savagery.'

Dr. Whitehead is inclined to believe that the two great rational religions, Buddhism and Christianity, are in decay. 'They have lost their ancient hold upon the world.' He seems to attribute this decline, at least in the case of Christianity, to the divorce from reality which a static dogmatic system involves. It is clear that his training in the methods of science has accustomed Dr. Whitehead to regard dogmas in the light of hypotheses, which is not the view which theologians usually take of them.

'Progress in truth—truth of science and truth of religion—is mainly a progress in the framing of concepts, in discarding artificial abstractions or partial metaphors, and in evolving notions which strike more deeply into the root of reality.'

Another point, not overlooked by trained theologians, but generally forgotten in popular presentations of Christianity, is that the status of a dogma depends upon the status of the system of thought in terms of which it is formulated.

'You cannot claim absolute finality for a dogma without claiming a commensurate finality for the sphere of thought within which it arose. If the dogmas of the Christian Church from the second to the sixth centuries

* *Religion in the Making.* By A. N. Whitehead, F.R.S., D.Sc., etc. (Cambridge University Press. Price 6/-.)

express finally and sufficiently the truths concerning the topics about which they deal, then the Greek philosophy of that period had developed a system of ideas of equal finality. You cannot limit the inspiration to a narrow circle of creeds.'

It may be said in reply to this that the inadequacy of a theological formula does not prejudice the truth of the doctrine of which it is an inadequate expression. But this contention overlooks the fact that expression itself is a stimulus to thought ('the expressive sign is more than interpretable. It is creative. It elicits the intuition which interprets it.') The fact is that formulae, when retained after their corresponding system of thought has become extinct, repress the creative stimulus in the religion whose truths they seek to protect. New formulae may be no more final than the old ones, but they do not constrict religion in the same way. And when it is time for them to be replaced, such replacement will occur. It is true that only a living religion can elaborate new expressions for itself. But we should be loth to admit that our religion is no longer alive.

The trouble with conventional presentations of Christianity is that: (1) all the emphasis is laid upon events remote both in time and in quality from present experience; and (2) formulations of religious truths are made in terms of a system of thought not only extinct but actually incomprehensible save to experts. The results are disastrous, for 'what fails to evoke any response in immediate apprehension stifles the religious life.'

What makes things even more difficult is that, meanwhile, while Christian theology has remained unprogressive, 'Science has appeared as an organised system of thought which in many respects has played the part of a theology, by reason of the answers which it gave to current theological questions. Science suggests a cosmology; and whatever suggests a cosmology, suggests a religion.'

The strength of the 'religion of science' is that it retains flexibility of adaptation. This the old systems, Christian or Buddhist, do not seem to possess; and adaptation to environment is the first condition of life: only so can the environment be conquered.

Modernists are quite alive to the contentions of Dr. Whitehead, and have been so for many years. They trust that his lectures may have the result of causing to dogmatists on both sides of the Atlantic some searchings of heart. But such persons have been blessed with an invincible impenetrability of mind.

J.C.H.

LIGHT AND SHADE.*

Sir James Marchant has varied his labour of editing composite volumes by making a collection of brief extracts from the writings of Dean Inge. A prominent characteristic of the composite volumes is that they are devoid of anything to which their intended readers are likely to take serious exception, and are therefore in parts a little dull; in other parts, more than a little. The field of research which has yielded the present little book is itself a sufficient guarantee against dullness. The Dean has struggled with his modesty with sufficient success to enable him to contribute a preface. 'It is,' he tells us, 'Sir James and not myself who asserts that I am witty and wise, or sometimes the one and sometimes the other.' The qualification is important. The extracts made under the headings of Religion and The Eternal Values are adequately indicative of

* *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge.* Selected and arranged by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1927. Price 3/6.)

the reasons for the Dean's deserved eminence as a Christian teacher; here indeed are echoes of 'the wisdom that is from above.' But the collection of sayings on matters sociological and those of the nature of general reflections on life are scarcely typical of the not only brilliant (for these sayings are that) but biting and extremely provocative wit which is characteristic of the Dean's pronouncements. It is the Dean's deliverances on subjects other than those immediately connected with religious thought which have made him more widely known than any other contemporary English clergyman. Few of the more remarkable of them appear in this collection. The book might easily have been much longer without lowering the quality of the citations; sayings equally wise and witty could be found in the Dean's *Faith and Knowledge, Truth and Falsehood in Religion, Faith and its Psychology, Studies of English Mystics,* none of which has been drawn upon for the present selection. The extracts made from *Christian Mysticism* might well have included the following, which we quote in conclusion:

> 'They (men of pre-eminent saintliness) tell us that they have arrived gradually at an unshakable conviction, not based on inference but on immediate experience, that God is a Spirit with whom the human spirit can hold intercourse; that in Him meet all they can imagine of goodness, truth and beauty; that they can see His footprints everywhere in nature, and feel His presence within them as the very life of their life, so that in proportion as they come to themselves they come to Him. They tell us that what separates us from Him and from happiness is, first, self-seeking in all its forms; and, secondly, sensuality in all its forms; that these are the ways of darkness and death, which hide from us the face of God; while the path of the just is like a shining light, which shineth more and more into the perfect day. As they toiled up the narrow way, the Spirit has spoken to them of Christ, and has enlightened the eyes of their understandings, till they have at least *begun* to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, and to be filled with all the fulness of God.'

J.S.B.

CHRISTIANITY AT EPHESUS.*

In this book the venerable scholar, Dr. J. Estlin Carpenter, whose lamented death is a serious loss to theological scholarship, offers an exposition of the New Testament literature traditionally associated with the name of St. John. An expert both in Old Testament and New Testament studies, as well as in the science of comparative religion, he is eminently qualified to deal with his difficult subject-matter as seen in the context of the world in which it originated. Abounding in evidence of the widest reading and erudition, and delightfully written, his book is designed for readers without technical knowledge. Predominantly expositional, it reads for the most part like a running commentary on the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. A short account of the three Johannine Epistles is added as an Epilogue. The exposition of the Apocalypse proceeds with profuse illustrations from the researches of Dieterich, Gunkel, Bousset and Boll. The work of Dr. R. H. Charles receives full and generous recognition, but Dr. Carpenter dissents from his suggested rearrangement of the text, and also from that put forward more recently by

* *The Johannine Writings.* By J. Estlin Carpenter, D.D., D.Litt. (London: Constable and Co., Ltd. 1927. Pp. 472. Price 30/-.)

Dr. Oman. Dr. Carpenter finds the least unsatisfactory explanation of the contradictions in the existence of the later form of the Nero *redivivus* legend, viz., that Nero had returned from Hades reincarnate in the person of Domitian. He holds that the Apocalypse and the Gospel originated in the vicinity of Ephesus towards the close of the first century, but that they are not the work of a single author. He hesitates to accept the view that John the Apostle suffered martyrdom about the same time as James under Herod Agrippa I, but he concludes that the Gospel is the work of John the Elder, and the Apocalypse that of a Christian prophet, John the Seer.

Dr. Carpenter believes that although the author of the Gospel used tradition, both oral and written, the picture given of the life and person of Jesus is the result of various influences—those of the Palestinian and Gentile environments of the earliest 'good news,' that of St. Paul, of the Judaism of the Dispersion, of the mystery-religions, and of an incipient Gnosticism. About the historical authenticity of this picture Dr. Carpenter is quite definite; the Gospel represents a transformation of the original story; that it should have preserved any significant historical information more accurately than the Synoptic Gospels is considered unlikely. Admitting that the Prologue was written chiefly for the Jew, Dr. Carpenter interprets it from its Greek rather than from its Jewish side. This particular controversy is, as Canon Streeter has remarked,[1] a curiously futile one, since it is extremely unlikely that John was ignorant of either. In any case the historical fact is that its great theme that the Word was made flesh

> 'won the Greek to Christ and secured for the Sermon on the Mount a permanent place within the robe of dogmatic glory woven round His Person ready to come forth with new power if that robe should ever be withdrawn.'

It is in the light of the same great theme that the historic facts have been spiritualized, not without impairing their actuality. As with the Apocalypse, so with the Gospel, Dr. Carpenter's exposition takes considerable account of pagan parallels. Thus, while the sign at Cana of Galilee undoubtedly symbolizes the issue of the good wine of Christianity when the wine of Judaism had failed, the story itself appears as a transformation of the miracles of Dionysos (the production of wine on certain occasions) into an imaginative symbol of the glory of Christ.

The whole tone and manner of Dr. Carpenter's work will enable those whose attitude to 'the robe of dogmatic glory' (which undoubtedly surrounds the person of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel) is widely different from his own, thoroughly to appreciate the dignity and the beauty of his exposition of the spiritual teaching of the Gospel. Such readers, while they will be disposed to minimize the significance of the pagan analogies quoted, will not feel that Dr. Carpenter has ransacked the ancient world in order to find parallels everywhere:

> 'With some common religious terminology and corresponding appeals to analogous phrases of inner experience, the *Hermetica* and the Fourth Gospel appear wholly independent. Each makes its contribution to the spiritual life of its age in its own form.'

Dr. Carpenter is also very cautious in dealing with recent suggestions concerning the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Mandaean literature. The Mandaeans, a sect located in South Babylonia, on account of the prominence in their Scriptures of John, Baptism, and the Jordan, are held

[1] *The Four Gospels*, p. 374.

to have originated in the disciples of John the Baptist. Their Scriptures reveal some striking parallels to Johannine language. It has often been held that the treatment of the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel as it now stands is due to a rivalry between the disciples of Jesus and those of John. It is now suggested that the Baptist's teaching was of a Mandaean type, and that the earlier teaching of Jesus closely resembled that of the Baptist, Jesus being originally a disciple of John. From this it is argued that an early form of Johannine Christianity is really older than the Synoptic presentation. Dr. Carpenter feels that it is too early to pronounce judgment on these 'startling novelties' which 'will need a very firm basis. At present these speculations have only been flung out into the air.'

J.S.B.

IN DEFENCE OF THE FAITH.*

Anyone who opens Mr. Gardner's book expecting to find either a reasoned defence or a modern restatement of traditional theology will be disappointed. The author's main interest is manifestly in persons rather than in doctrines. His first chapter is called 'The Dean of St. Paul's and the Philosophy of Modernism.' It contains no more than a few casual remarks on the weaknesses of modern philosophy—pragmatism, subjective idealism, and anti-intellectualism. From these errors the Dean of St. Paul's has been preserved by his Platonism, though he has yielded to the spirit of the age in that he is an anti-supernaturalist, who 'reads Christ in the light of Neoplatonism, instead of Neoplatonism and all other things in the light of Christ.' Of statement or criticism of 'the philosophy of Modernism' there is none; there are many and varied extracts from Dr. Inge's books, but, after all, 'Dr. Inge is in no sense of the word a Modernist except in the matter of Biblical criticism, and even here he is only half-Modernist'!

The first chapter is typical of the book. Mr. Gardner proceeds to discuss, or, more exactly, to make a few remarks about, the views of 'some women rebels.' These include, among others, Mary Wollstonecraft, Harriet Martineau, Sara Hennell, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Lily Dougall, May Sinclair, Evelyn Underhill and Mrs. Herman, of whom the last two are labelled 'definitely Christian.' 'Modern Romanism' has gone astray in its doctrine of the Mass, but is chiefly dealt with by a discussion of Mr. Chesterton and Mr. Belloc; its most serious errors are found in exaggerations of the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, and in the teaching of St. Alphonsus of Liguori. 'Protestantism' is next treated as exemplified in its outstanding figures (and a few who are otherwise) from Milton and Bunyan to Miss Christabel Pankhurst. Mr. Gardner finds the faith, which he regards himself as defending, in Anglo-Catholicism; yet not altogether in an Anglo-Catholicism of this world. For he feels there is both need and room for a new type. Of this, Dr. John Donne (1573-1631) was the forerunner and Dr. Pusey the scholar. These are they who achieved a synthesis of the new knowledge and the traditional faith.

In his Epilogue, Mr. Gardner is moved to confess that in the body of his book he has sometimes been subdued by his sympathies and thrown off his critical guard. We select one instance out of many for his consideration. He quotes the Bishop of Birmingham as writing that Scholasticism 'incorporated a certain amount of Greek philosophy (imperfectly apprehended Platonism rather than the real Plato) and some bad science.' His comment is: 'As for Plato, surely Bishop Barnes has made a slip of the

* *In Defence of the Faith.* By Charles Gardner. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1927. Price 12/6.)

pen. Aristotle, and not Plato, governed medieval Scholasticism.' A little more care in his study of Dr. Inge's '*Plotinus*' would have shown Mr. Gardner that the matter is not so simple, nor Dr. Barnes so obviously wrong; for Dr. Inge holds that St. Thomas 'is nearer to Plotinus than to the real Aristotle,' and says 'As long as St. Thomas is the norm of scientific orthodoxy, the philosophy of the Church must remain predominantly Neoplatonic' (vol. i, p. 15).

Mr. Gardner's love of epigram has sometimes led him so near to the boundaries of the truth as occasionally to step over them. Anselm, he says, 'considered that dogma was less than the truth: they (Modernists), though they do not say it, that truth is less than the dogma.' Once more, 'To-day we have the odd sight, which yet provokes but little comment, of men in the Church holding the Unitarian doctrine, repeating the Trinitarian creeds, jibing at the faith, taking pay from the Church, and all the time thinking themselves mentally honest and clean.' These are examples of sayings in Mr. Gardner's book which illustrate the truth of his own dictum: 'To bear false witness to another man's religion has been the practice of Christians in all ages.'

On the other hand, Mr. Gardner's book shows wide reading; it is pleasantly written, and contains many penetrating sayings scattered about in odd places. He sees the folly of those Anglo-Catholics who take over all the developments of Modern Romanism and wish to make them obligatory in the English Church. If they should succeed 'we cannot help feeling that, whatever the gain, the loss would be greater'; and 'the extreme wing may at any time make a grand submission to Rome, and we should still be left with the main body of Anglo-Catholics.' On the Roman issue he wisely observes that 'a succession of theologians from Hooker and Andrews to Laud and Pearson constructed their defence or apologia of the Anglican Church, which left little to be done by succeeding ages,' and that it is 'ardent young spirits who have forgotten or never known their apologetics' who slip easily over to Rome.

Mr. Gardner's book, indeed, may be read with interest if it is approached in the way one approaches a volume of 'Personalities and Opinions,' and not in the way suggested by its title.

J.S.B.

GREAT ENGLISH CHURCHMEN.*

The history of the past needs to be re-written constantly, not necessarily because we have discovered new facts about it, but because our conception of the right interpretation of the facts differs from that of former historians. Doubtless it is some such motive which has prompted Mr. Sidney Dark (editor of the *Church Times*) to undertake the editing of the Great English Churchmen Series, of which the first five volumes have just appeared. Mr. Dark's aim is not to be impartial but readable, and if possible at the same time to rectify certain Protestant and nationalist prejudices which have marred some of our standard ecclesiastical biographies. The editor has certainly succeeded in his aim of being readable.

Thomas Cranmer's life by Canon Anthony Deane is distinctly hostile to Henry VIII and his Archbishop, and seems to lack that truer, larger way

* *Thomas Cranmer.* By Canon Anthony C. Deane.
* *John Wesley.* By the Very Rev. W. H. Hutton, D.D.
* *Thomas Arnold.* By Rev. R. J. Campbell, D.D.
* *Archbishop Laud.* By Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones.
* *St. Thomas of Canterbury.* By Sidney Dark. (Published by Macmillans, 6/- each 1927.)

of viewing men and affairs which characterises Professor Pollard's *Henry VIII.* Truly the English Reformation was, to use Mr. Birrell's phrase, 'barbarously conducted,' but could the Papal supremacy have been extirpated in England by 'sweet reasonableness'? No dispassionate student of the persecuted Lollard Movement will doubt that the adherents of the Papacy were resolved to conquer at whatever cost of human misery. The verdict of some of them on the upshot might well have been that of the mutilated Adoni-zedek: 'As I have done, so hath God done unto me.' The destruction of beautiful things was appalling, but those who prostituted art to superstition were most to blame. Cranmer was a weak man, and Henry tyrannical and lustful, but each in his way possessed great abilities, and they were even morally above the level of most of their contemporaries.

Dean Hutton, whose volume abounds in exact and curious learning, brings out more clearly than is usual the less attractive aspects of John Wesley's character and activities. Here we see less of the saint than of the man, but what a man he was, so absolutely virile save as a husband!

Mr. Duncan-Jones has written an extremely sympathetic life of Laud. Whatever Laud's limitations of policy and sympathy, he was a wholehearted lover of the Reformed Church of England, and with no love for either Papal or Puritan innovations. His conduct entirely justified his declaration:—

> 'I will die with these words in my mouth, "That I never intended, much less endeavoured, the subversion of the laws of the kingdom; nor the bringing of Popish superstition upon the true Protestant religion established by law in the kingdom"' (p. 262).

Mr. Duncan-Jones points out that for Laud transubstantiation, invocation of saints, communion in one kind, and adoration of images, were Popish superstitions.

Thomas Arnold, the champion of the Religion of Jesus Christ in the face of the forces of secularism and sacerdotalism, is interestingly treated by Dr. R. J. Campbell, who regards Mr. Lytton Strachey's essay as a caricature. Dr. Campbell's biography contains at least one piece of new material, an eloquent letter sent by Arnold to Keble protesting against Keble's practical excommunication of him (pp. 156*f.*). Arnold's famous utterance, which is often cited as exhibiting the futility of pessimistic prediction in connection with the English Church, sounds ominously to-day:

> 'The Church, as it now stands, no human power can save: my fear is, that, if we do not mind, we shall come to the American fashion, and have no provision made for the teaching of Christianity at all' (p. 199).

Mr. Dark has elected to write the biography of the great champion of Hildebrandine policy in England. Becket appears in his pages as he did in life—a turbulent ecclesiastic, obstinate, courageous, superstitious, casuistical, arrogant. Yet it must be conceded that he believed himself to be contending for the right, although his efforts appeared to his sovereign to be prompted by ungrateful and hypocritical personal ambition. What Shakespeare wrote of another, may well be applied to him: 'Nothing in his life became him like the leaving it. He died as one that had been studied in his death.' Like Samson, his death did more for his cause than did his life. He deserved to be canonized by the Pope. The Editor of the *Church Times* concludes his biography characteristically: 'And in the English Church, that he loved so well, St. Thomas of Canterbury is again

revered, and on his Feast Day, English men and English women do not forget to pray:

> "O God, Who for Thy Church's sake didst suffer Thy Bishop Saint Thomas gloriously to be slain by the swords of wicked men: grant, we beseech Thee, that all they who call upon him for succour may be profited by the obtaining of all that they desire."'

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MYTHICAL THEORY OF THE GOSPELS.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

I should like to add a few remarks in support of the arguments put forward by the Rev. C. J. Wright in his recent article dealing with the mythical theory of the Gospels. He does not refer to any details mentioned in Georg Brandes' book, *Jesus a Myth*, perhaps because he does not think that Brandes produces any fresh arguments. Any attempt to deal thoroughly and seriously with Brandes' mis-quotations and misinterpretations of the Gospels would exceed the limits of an ordinary letter, but I may perhaps be allowed to indicate some of his errors in comparative mythology.

Brandes' references to Mithraism and Zoroastrianism are so vague as to be almost valueless. Mithra does not rise again, except in the same sense that the sun rises every morning, and he does not confer the boon of resurrection on his votaries, but rather, so far as we know anything definite about it, the immortality of the soul (p. 75).

'The Holy Ghost of the Avesta' (p. 75), apparently, represents Spenta Mainyu, another title of Ahura Mazda, but it does not seem ever to have been conceived as a separate hypostasis. The conception of the Holy Ghost as feminine, which emerges in the apocryphal Gospel to the Hebrews, is due, as most scholars would admit, to the feminine gender of Ruach and its equivalents. But the comparison with Cybele, who was not the mother but rather the grandmother and lover of Attis, is, to say the least, far-fetched (p. 97).

One more example may suffice. The origin and functions of Osiris, who may have been imported from ancient Babylonia into Egypt, are fairly enigmatic even to well-informed Egyptologists. But it is a mythological *tour de force* to identify Osiris' turning water into wine, if the evidence of Epiphanius on this point can be trusted, with the story of the marriage at Cana. The eleventh day of the month of Tobi (Egyptian chronology) may be January 5th, and that is nearly the same as January 6th, the original date of the commemoration of the Nativity of our Lord, but there is no reason to suppose that the marriage at Cana occurred on the same date. Otherwise the comparison of dates is irrelevant. At most, we may admit an element of symbolism in the Gospel narrative.

Apart from other points, Brandes' standpoint is represented by his closing words: 'Divine figures can never be affected by having lived their true and only lives in the minds of men' (p. 190). But, as Mr. Wright has truly pointed out, history is an affair of living persons, and we claim that Christianity is, above all, an historical religion, not an idealistic philosophy or a nature-myth.

L. PATTERSON.

[*In the Press.*]

PROBATION IN EUROPE

By

T. W. TROUGHT, B.A., J.P.

President of the National Association of Probation Officers

Demy 8vo, cloth 7*s.* 6*d. net*

The new legislation which came into force in 1926 made that year the *annus mirabilis* of the British probation system, and has brought the subject much into the public eye.

This book, the first synoptic view of European probation systems, provides a wealth of authoritative information, drawn mainly from official sources, with regard to Probation of Offenders, Children's Courts, and the Treatment of the Adolescent. The information is based on replies to a questionnaire sent by the author to more than thirty European countries. These replies come from such unimpeachable authorities as Judges, Chief Probation Officers, Ministries of Justice and of Social Welfare, etc., and give a succinct account of the extent to which Probation of Offenders is used as a judicial method of dealing with law-breakers in Europe. They are amplified and supplemented by the conclusions of the author, who has spent the past eighteen months on the Continent, engaged in exhaustive research in the various countries.

Mr. Trought also visited most of the important probation departments in the U.S.A. during 1925, and the book is further enriched with the results of this study, and with his notes on probationary methods in England and Wales and elsewhere, and with some illuminating statistics.

This work should be deeply interesting to the general public and invaluable to all those concerned with Welfare Work and the problem of the juvenile delinquent.

Basil Blackwell - Broad Street - Oxford

TWO NOTABLE REPRINTS.

THE WORKS OF SIR GEORGE ETHEREGE

Vols I and II. *Edited by H. F. B. Brett-Smith, M.A.*

NOW READY.

This is the first Authentic Text of the *Plays* of SIR GEORGE ETHEREGE which, indeed, have been reprinted once only since the early XVIIIth Century, and then in a limited Edition modernised from a late text.

In this edition the plays are published in two volumes at 15*s. net.*

In order to render this edition of Etherege definitive there will be a third volume containing the *Poems* and the best of the *Letters*, issued to subscribers only, at 15*s. net.*

This is the Sixth of the Percy Reprints.

THE NOVELS AND SELECTED WRITINGS OF DANIEL DEFOE.

The set of Fourteen Volumes, at 7/6 a volume (issued serially), includes the following:

THE ADVENTURES OF ROBINSON CRUSOE—THE FARTHER ADVENTURES—THE LIFE AND PIRACIES OF THE FAMOUS CAPTAIN SINGLETON—THE KING OF PIRATES: CAPTAIN AVERY—THE APPARITION OF ONE MRS. VEAL—PAMPHLETS—MEMOIRS OF A CAVALIER—THE TRUE-BORN ENGLISHMAN—AN APPEAL TO HONOUR AND JUSTICE—THE FORTUNES OF MOLL FLANDERS—THE SHORTEST WAY WITH THE DISSENTERS—A HYMN TO THE PILLORY—LEGION'S MEMORIAL—A JOURNAL OF THE PLAGUE YEAR—THE HISTORY OF COLONEL JACK—THE FORTUNATE MISTRESS, OR ROXANA—AN ACCOUNT OF THE LATE JOHN GOW.

Great care has been taken in the preparation of the texts and this edition represents what Defoe actually wrote and is free from the later accretions and alterations which were frequently made in his work.

BASIL BLACKWELL : OXFORD